COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE THEOLOGICAL FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. XVI.—No. 1.

FEBRUARY, 1896.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1896.

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are $2.00 per annum, payable in advance which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department and all exchanges to PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, Ph. D., Columbus, O.

CONTENTS OF No. 1.

PAGE

THE USE OF SCRIPTURE PROOF PASSAGES IN CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION. By Rev. H. P. Dannecker, A. M..... 1

"REMEMBER THE SABBATH DAY TO KEEP IT HOLY." By Rev. E. H. D. Winterhoff, A. M..... 29

A SHORT HISTORY OF PIETISM. By Rev. P. A. Peter..... 40

WHAT DOES THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACH CONCERNING WOMAN'S SOCIAL POSITION IN CHRISTENDOM. By Prof. Dr. Noesgen. Translated by Rev. F. W. Abicht..... 49

The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology.

BY

DR. KRAUTH.

PRICE, - - - - - - - $5.00.

Doctrinal Theology of the Ev. Lutheran Church.

BY

HEINRICH SCHMIDT, D.D.

PRICE, - - - - - - - - - $4.00.

Book of Concord.

TRANSLATED BY

HENRY E. JACOBS, D.D.

Kurtz' Church History.

COMPLETE. REVISED EDITION.

PRICE, - - $3.00.

The Way of Salvation in the Lutheran Church.

BY

REV. G. H. GERBERDING.

PRICE, - - - - - - - - - - $1.00.

NEW TESTAMENT CONVERSIONS.

By the Same Author.

PRICE, - - - - - - - $1.00.

Columbus Theological Magazine

Volumes 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

BOUND IN HALF ROAN, SINGLE VOLUME $2.00.

Those ordering Complete Set, will be furnished same at $1.50 per Volume.

ADDRESS ALL ORDERS TO

J. L. TRAUGER, 55, 57, 59 East Main St., COLUMBUS, O.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. XVI. FEBRUARY, 1896. No. 1.

THE USE OF SCRIPTURE PROOF PASSAGES IN CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION.

BY REV. H. P. DANNECKER, A. M., FORT WAYNE, IND.

God grant that we may not disparage this subject in any one's mind by an unskilled treatment of it. It is of the utmost importance to the church of our blessed Savior. In the direction in which it points lie strength and prosperity for Zion. Let the strength which Luther's Catechism gave to the Reformation, let the prosperity, the internal growth and solidity of such congregations, in which the old historical method of instructing by way of catechization is in vogue, attest the truth of what we say. It is our firm conviction, that, if we could build up the walls of Zion in such a way that they will stand without human props, without all sorts of human contrivances and inventions and schemes with which so many congregations to-day must be entertained and pampered to keep them from dissolution, we must pay more attention to the religious instruction of our children and to that end return to the old method of catechetical instruction. Our duty to "build up" is paramount to that of "gathering in." We are not disparaging missionary work. We cannot do too much of that. But whoever

neglects his own flock, his own household, the congregation to which he already has, on the plea of gathering in the stranger, is not only an unfaithful pastor, but also a very superficial reasoner. "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." Acts 20, 28. "If any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." 1 Tim. 5, 8. Is it worse to starve the body than to starve the soul? Either you have a flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseer, or you have no business to officiate as a pastor. Jer. 23, 31. 32. But if you have a flock, no amount of outside mission work will excuse your neglecting it. Feed your own flock first. That is paramount to all else. Besides, your reasoning is false, when you conclude that any mission work which you may do at the expense of your own flock is worth doing at all. "He also serves the Lord who only stands and waits." You cannot serve the cause of missions better than by doing your duty at home first, by building up your own congregation, by indoctrinating your people, by instructing them, not only or even principally in missionary statistics, but first of all in the old Bible truths, in the chief parts of our excellent catechism. Let no one disparage the building up of well-indoctrinated congregations with a view of aiding the cause of missions. It would be folly. The weak as well as the strong man may serve the devil, but when they both serve the Lord who will deny that the strong man makes the better servant. Biblical knowledge does not insure zeal in the Lord's cause, but when coupled with a live, zealous faith, who will deny that it does not make the best missionary? Zeal without knowledge is a dangerous thing. Rom. 10, 2. No, we are not discouraging missionary activity when we say that "building up" must go before "gathering

in." We are pleading for more competent missionary forces when we raise the cry for more thorough work in the home congregation and call for a general return to the good, old method of catechetical instruction. "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces." Ps. 122, 6. 7.

WHAT WE UNDERSTAND BY CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION.

What we understand by catechetical instruction has woefully fallen into disuse. You will seek in vain for it in sectarian churches. The German Reformed and Episcopalians, perhaps, are the only ones who have anything resembling it. The Presbyterian church has a catechism, but we have never heard of its being used by way of catechetical instruction. Even the General Synod, a body claiming to be Lutheran, though it has an authorized catechism, leaves the use of it to the option of its pastors, and there are not a few of its clergy who prefer the mourner's bench and revivals to catechetical instruction. The fact is that such instruction has not only fallen into disuse, but there is an actual aversion to anything like a catechism in the sectarian camp. It is the old Carlstadt and Muenzer spirit that possesses these fanatical sects and makes them pronounce the written Word a dead letter, and the Sacraments impotent symbols, and cast an odium on one of the very best weapons which the church can wield against the kingdom of darkness—a good, practical, orthodox catechism. If it were possible, we would suggest that all their evangelists and revival preachers should be boiled down into one good, solid catechism, but it is not possible in more than one sense. The Lutheran church has a different spirit, as Luther said to Zwingli, and her catechism is one of the fruits of that spirit, and in proportion as that spirit takes hold of our pastors and people,

will they appreciate that catechism and engrave it upon the hearts of their children by the very best methods of instruction.

NOT THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

That method is not the Sunday school. Catechetical instruction and Sunday-school instruction must not be confounded. Would that they were identical! But they are not. Catechetical instruction as it should be and Sunday-school instruction as it is, differ essentially. If they are made to coincide the Sunday school will simply develop into what we call "Christenlehre." It is not the division of the scholars into classes that constitutes the difference. Such a division might become necessary even in Christenlehre, although one teacher can well catechize a large school. It is not only by answering, but also by hearing that those, who are catechized, learn. There is a difference between "socratizing" and "catechizing." Socrates taught his pupils by skillful questions,which caused the pupil to develop what nature had already put into his mind. But the object of catechizing is to teach the religion of Jesus Christ, which nature has put into no man's mind, and which, therefore, cannot be developed, but must be communicated. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." Rom. 10, 17. Socrates required small classes; a Christian catechist can instruct a large audience. It is not the number of teachers, either, which constitutes the difference between the Sunday school and what we understand by catechetical instruction. If there may be many classes, there may be many teachers, too, although, as has been said, one good catechist can instruct a large school. The art of catechizing, however, is very difficult, and requires more skill and learning than the average Sunday-school teacher can possibly have without special training. For this very reason Christenlehre ought

to be preferred, because it places the religious instruction of the children in the hands of the pastor or parochial teacher, who have had such special training. This is no discredit to Sunday-school teachers. All honor to them for their willingness to do what they can in the feeding of Jesus' lambs. They do what they can, although what they do is not enough and ought to satisfy no pastor. They can hear the children read the lesson and recite the text and answer the printed questions. They can do this with safety equally as well as the pastor himself. And this amounts to something. It is a great deal better than nothing at all, provided the lessons and texts and questions are so chosen as to do no harm. The very choice of texts may do harm. A good selection of texts is a prime duty of a good catechist, just as the selection of texts for his sermons is a chief duty of the pastor. The Bible is certainly God's Word from lid to lid, and any book, any chapter, any verse is fit matter for profitable study. And yet the selection of texts for the instruction of others dare not be made at random. There is a divine rule for it. "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." 2 Tim. 2, 15. There is law and there is gospel in the Bible. Each has its own peculiar use. There is a vital difference between them. Each has its own peculiar effect upon the soul of man. They should be divided rightly. The religious teacher who fails to do this is not approved of God, he is a workman that needeth to be ashamed. Luther says in his sermon on the difference between the law and the gospel: "St. Paul's meaning (in Gal. 3, 23. 24.) is this, that in Christendom both preachers and hearers should teach and learn to know a certain difference between the law and the gospel, between works and faith." In the face of all this, is not the selection of texts for the Sunday school a matter of infinite importance, that ought never be left to the inexperienced and least of all to such who are known to be false teachers,

mixers of law and gospel? Sectarian lesson leaves, like the International, etc., though they may contain no particular false doctrine, ought to be rejected by every Lutheran, because they are the handiwork of those who, a priori, do not rightly divide the Word of truth, and whose very selection of lessons ought to be an object of suspicion on that account. In our humble opinion this feverish clamor for new selections, for lesson leaves and all sorts of Sunday-school auxiliaries, is not begotten by the spirit of Luther. If any church in this world needs to go abegging for such selections, it is not the Lutheran. Let others copy from us. We have the best, the purest, the simplest, the most thorough and comprehensive selection that has ever yet been put upon paper. Do you ask what it is? Let us put it in large type: LUTHER'S SMALL CATECHISM! Have you ever found a lesson leaf or Sunday-school help to equal it? It is perfectly safe; it is adapted to the wants of the smallest child; it is brief, containing the CHIEF parts of Christian doctrine, and yet it is so comprehensive, so full of matter, that no scholar will ever be able to exhaust it though he go to Sunday school until his hair turn grey. "Consider those the best and most useful preachers," says Luther, "who can handle the catechism well, that is, who can rightly teach the Ten Commandments, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer; they are rare birds." Back to Luther! Back to his catechism, the gem of our church! Back to catechetical instruction which is the only sensible and approved method of fixing the precious truths of that catechism in the minds and hearts of the little children! Back to the old historic Christenlehre, in which the catechism is the text book, the pastor or a trained teacher the instructor, and catechizing the method of instruction. But the Sunday school is not what we mean by catechetical instruction.

NOT LECTURING.

Prior to confirmation, children in the Lutheran church are instructed by the pastor in the doctrines of the church. This is technically called "catechetical instruction." It is not this, either, that is meant in the caption of this article. Such instruction, sometimes, is anything but "catechetical instruction." Some pastors lecture rather than catechize. It is natural for a pastor to be more at home in sermonizing than in catechizing, in fact, our experience has been that it is much more difficult to catechize than to preach. But a sermon is not a catechization, although a good catechization may well be called a sermon for children. Such instruction of children in which the pastor "preaches," does not deserve the name of "catechetical instruction," for there is nothing catechetical about it except this that the catechism furnishes the text.

NOT MERELY MEMORIZING.

Some pastors leave the children to do all the work. They are veritable taskmasters who say to the little slaves under their charge: "Go ye, get you straw where ye can find it: yet not aught of your work shall be diminished." Ex. 5, 11. It is all memorizing, and a great deal of it, and when the child has crammed two or three pages of the catechism into its head and succeeded, by main force, to close down the lid of its little brain to keep it all in, then it can truthfully say: "I have my lesson!" for it really has all that it is going to get. It is no wonder at all if such children become prejudiced against the catechetical instruction of their pastor. It is slave's work. There is nothing catechetical about it. The pastor ought to work as hard as the children. He ought to furnish the "straw" at any rate. A good catechization will make the memorizing easy for the children, because it makes the matter intelligible and interesting. Of

course, children ought to memorize. They can easily learn Luther's smaller catechism by heart, not only the chief parts, but also the general confession, the prayers, the table of duties and the Christian questions. Our children, who attend a parochial school, learn every answer and every passage in the Ohio Synod catechism, besides 40 hymns, 8 psalms, the principal data of the history of the Reformation, the festivals of the church year, the books of the Old and New Testament, the Bible histories published by our Synod, every German missionary and Christmas service published by our Book Concern, and yet we have heard but very few complaints about "too much memorizing" on the part of the children or their parents. All this is accomplished, not by tedious memorizing and hard "clubbing," but by actual catechizing, which lays the greater bulk of the work on the shoulders of the teacher. It is a shame, a crying sin to confirm classes in our churches, of which even the most gifted children can hardly repeat the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments without explanations; but it is just as great a shame and sin if the teacher or pastor leaves all the work to the children and saves his own lazy hide. Let us have more "catechetical instruction," which means a great deal of extra hard work, but also a great extra blessing.

Scripture proof-passages are used in the Sunday school, the catechetical lecture and the catechetical stuffing process, which we mentioned above. It is not this use of them, however, that we wish to discuss here. The effect of a proof-passage, like that of a gem, depends greatly upon the setting in which you place it. The strongest proof-passage may be rendered ineffective by a wrong method of teaching. It is something like the little boy who put on his papa's silk hat and wanted his mama to decide whether it looked best on the top or the side or the back of his head. "It makes no difference," said the mother, "it is out of place wherever you put it." And so a proof-passage will be out of place in a

wrong method wherever you put it. The best "setting" for a Scripture proof-passage for the instruction of children is that logical and scriptural development of some doctrinal theme in questions and answers, called a catechization or catechetical instruction.

THE CATECHIZATION.

The term catechizing is generic, being derived from the Greek word, meaning to instruct orally by means of questions and answers on any subject. Usage, however, has given it a specific meaning, and it now designates religious instruction only. In the early days of the Christian church its use was not limited to the instruction of children nor to the mode of questions and answers, but stood for religious instruction in general. "Let him that is taught (katechoumenos) in the word communicate unto him that teacheth (katechounti) in all good things." Gal. 6, 6. But now it is chiefly used to designate the oral instruction of children on religious topics by means of questions and answers.

As a method of teaching it has developed into a special science called catechetics, and commands an important place in the course of every Christian pedagogical school. It is not surprising at all that this science has been developed chiefly in Germany, as is shown by its very terminology, since religion is taught in the public schools of Germany and the best method of teaching it must therefore be a part of every German teacher's accomplishments. If the teachers of our public schools would be required to teach religion, catechetics would be a very important study in every Normal school in the land, and they would hardly refuse to make good use of the researches and studies of Rambach, Schuetze, Zezschwitz, Seidel, Palmer, Kohle, Fett and a host of others who have written extensive treatises on this science, even though they be as German as Bismarck. But the very

fact that our religion is not taught in our public schools, ought to incite every Lutheran pastor to study this science most thoroughly, for the religious instruction of his children depends entirely upon him, and he ought to be able to give them the very best.

The object of catechetics is to teach the art of catechizing. Like any other science, it does not furnish but simply trains and develops a gift already possessed. As logic does not impart, but simply trains the reasoning faculties, so catechetics will not impart the gift of catechizing, but lays down certain rules which will enable the catechist to put his power to the best possible use.

"Catechizing is very beneficial," says Lindemann, "provided it is done in the right way.

It keeps the pupil constantly attentive and wide awake.

It exercises the intellectual powers, especially the reasoning faculties and the judgment, more than any other method of instruction.

It leads the pupil step by step to the knowledge of the truth, so that he will find it himself.

It affords the children the pleasure of finding the truth by their own exertion.

What is learned in this way will be retained better than what is merely memorized.

It also enables the children to lead others to the knowledge of certain truths.

Of course, if catechizing is poorly done, if you call an aimless quizzing, an exchange of mutilated questions and answers, a mere prompting and repeating, an examination for mere show, by this name, then catechizing is decidedly harmful, for it makes the child disinclined to think and speak, incapable of judging, dull, sleepy, despondent and angry. But such careless and superficial bungling work does not deserve the name of a catechization; it ought rather to be called a mischievous blunting of the child's

mind and heart against the divine truth." Schul-Praxis, p. 109.

A complete catechization has five different parts: The introduction, the text, the statement of the subject, or theme, the main discourse or execution, and the conclusion. These parts constitute it a complete discourse, with all the advantages for clearness and impressiveness which a properly arranged discourse affords, and such a presentation of a divine truth must certainly commend itself, even to a casual observer, in preference to the rambling method in which the inexperienced so often attempt to teach the truths of God's Word. It would require too much space to give a complete translation of one of the excellent treatises on catechization lying before us, for instance that of Rambach, although such a translation would serve best to set forth the true nature and great usefulness of a catechization, and might induce those, who have not yet tried this method, to give it more thought and a fair trial. Suffice it to say, that it is such a catechization, a logically arranged discourse on a text of the catechism in catechetical form, that we mean by "catechetical instruction" in the subject of this article, and nothing else. And now, having cleared the way, we will attempt to make a few suggestions in regard to the use of scriptural proof-passages in such instruction, although we must acknowledge that we would willingly resign this part of the discussion to more experienced hands. The subject is surely worthy of the very best treatment, and once more we hope that we may not disparage it in any one's mind.

THE USE OF SCRIPTURE PROOF-PASSAGES IN A CATECHIZATION.

"The catechist," says Rambach, "must not content himself with leaving the catechumens repeat the scripture passages without understanding them, but he must teach

them the meaning of these passages by questions and answers, and show them clearly the point to be proven." P. 22.

There are two things that demand our careful attention, if we would make good use of Scripture proof-passages in catechetical instruction: 1) A point or proposition to be proven; and 2) a Scripture passage to prove the proposition.

THE PROPOSITION TO BE PROVEN.

1. The proposition to be proven should be formulated. The necessity of this is quite apparent. Something is to be proven, and that something must be stated, and the fact that the whole process is for the instruction of children makes it imperatively necessary that the proposition be carefully and definitely formulated. The force of the very strongest proof passage may be utterly lost by a neglect in this respect. If the teacher knows not what he is about to prove, how shall the child know; and if he trusts to finding a chance formula as he rambles along, the chances are that he will miss his way and finally land at the foot of the proof-passage with a proposition that fits, as the Germans say, "like a fist on the eye." Before you start out to prove anything have your proposition well formulated.

2. If at all possible, the proposition should be in the words of the catechism. Let it be in Luther's words, if possible. That is the very best. This rule was followed in the arrangement of our synodical catechism, and it is one of the chief excellencies of the book. But Luther, in his catechism, teaches by silence as well as by speech. For instance, in his explanation of the third commandment, by his very silence he teaches that we are no longer bound to a fixed day and to its legal observance. His answer to the question: "What does this mean?" is complete. He tells us exactly what it means, and by his silence he tells us very forcibly what it does not mean. But the catechist must have a propo-

sition and so he must interpret this silence, put it into words and form a statement. In the above case a statement is given him in the short explanation, published by our Synod, question 41. Let the catechist use that in preference to his own. But here again the catechist must form new propositions. In the course of a catechization on the third commandment he must explain and show that the Jews in the Old Testament were bound to the ceremonial as well as the moral import of the law. This is implied in question 41, but not stated. Let the catechist again formulate his propositions in the words of the catechism.

He might say:

1. The Jews in the Old Testament were bound to the ceremonial import of the third commandment.

2. The Jews in the Old Testament were bound to the moral import of the third commandment.

He should say::

1. The children of God in the Old Testament were bound to a fixed day and to its legal observance.

2. The children of God in the Old Testament were bound to fear and love God, that they might not despise preaching and His Word, but hold it sacred and gladly hear and learn it.

This may not be the very best example that might be produced, but it serves to show what we mean when we say that, "if at all possible, the proposition should be in the words of the catechism." The use of this is apparent. Be it remembered that the instruction is by questions and answers, and the proposition, though suggested and brought out by the previous questions of the catechist, will finally be the child's own answer, and if given in words with which the pupil already is familiar, the truth expressed will be remembered more readily.

The importance of adhering to certain fixed words and expressions in the religious instruction of children, is em-

phasized by Luther in the Introduction to the Small Catechism: "Therefore we also should so teach these forms to the young and inexperienced as not to change a syllable, nor set them forth and recite them one year differently from another. Hence choose whatever form you think best, and adhere to it forever."

And that Luther's words should be the words to which every Lutheran catechist should adhere, is maintained by the best of them.

Rambach says: "The catechist must be careful to adhere closely to the words of Luther's catechism, . . . for Luther's words have such weight with the people that they are accepted without contradiction. . . . Luther's words are also so rich in wisdom and expression, that you will find plenty of material in them." P. 21.

What Lindemann says in reference to Dietrich's catechism applies equally well to our own: "Be it expressly and emphatically stated here, that every explanation in Dietrich's catechism can only have the purpose of rendering clear and dear to our scholars the contents of Luther's Smaller Catechism. Any treatment of Dietrich as a whole or of any part of it, which does not serve this purpose, must be considered a failure from the very start. It is necessary, therefore, always to start out from the text of the smaller catechism and always to return to it." Schul-Praxis, p. 109.

3. When you have a proposition which you are about to prove, stick to it. Do not reformulate or change it. Do not forget it. If you want the final proof to stick to the child's memory, you must get the proposition to stick, and if you want the proposition to stick to the child's mind, it must stick to your mind first. As Luther says: "Choose whatever form you think best, and adhere to it forever." Such a proposition is virtually the text, at least for the time being, even though the proof-process, in which you are engaged, be but a part of the whole catechiza-

tion, and what Lindemann says of the text, applies equally as well to the proposition: "The text of the catechization (i. e., the Word of God on which it is based) is generally some question from the catechism or a Bible passage. If the children have committed it to memory, it should not be read, but recited; if it is not memorized, it should be read, and not only once, but repeatedly It is very important that the text be properly emphasized, for this will greatly aid the children in understanding it. It is often well that the teacher himself read the text to the class; then have it read two or three times by individual scholars, and finally let the whole class read it. The text must be made very important in the eyes of the pupils, in order that they may pay due attention to it." Schul-Praxis, p. 111. And even so the proposition must be made very important in the eyes of the pupils, in order that they may pay due attention to it. This will never be done, however, unless the catechist sticks to his propositon.

4. The proposition to be proven should be clear, precise and short.

It should be clear. It should be expressed in words which the pupils can readily understand or be made to understand. Sometimes it is necessary to use terms which require an explanation, but it stands to reason that, as the child's mind should be concentrated entirely on the point to be proven, it is not well to divert its attention by entering into a lengthy explanation of the words and phrases of the proposition.

It should be precise. A precise statement will greatly aid the process of proving a proposition. The proposition should express the thing to be proven, no more and no less.

It should be short. It is equally necessary that the proposition be as short as is consistent with its clearness and precision. Brevity will aid to fix it in the child's memory and to set forth its connection with the proof-passage.

5. The proposition to be proven should be "within range" of the passage which is to prove it. This may require the catechist to analyze the propositions as he finds them in the short explanation of the smaller catechism. This is the process pursued by those who wrote the short explanation. They analyzed the smaller catechism, dividing each division into its respective subdivisions, and even such subdivisions into their component parts. Thus each commandment is divided into what is forbidden and what is commanded, and each command and prohibition is again subdivided, and even these subdivisions are divided into subdivisions, and so on. Thus the second commandment is divided like this:

SUBJECT: THE COMMANDMENT.

I. What is Forbidden?

1. What is meant by the name, etc.?
2. How is it taken in vain?
   - A. By cursing by God's name.
     - a) blaspheming God.
     - b) wishing one's self evil by God's name.
     - c) wishing others evil by God's name.
   - B. By swearing, etc.
     - a) what is meant by swearing?
     - b) when is swearing allowed?
     - c) what swearing is forbidden, etc., etc.

Here we have a division of such subdivisions. Now as the short explanation is an analysis of the smaller catechism, so the catechization should be a further analysis of the short explanation. "A catechist must give due heed to the manner of presenting things, as he must divide a subject into its smallest details and explain it with familiar illustrations and examples. A catechist must do as St. Paul did, 1 Thess. 2, 7: 'But we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children.' A nursing mother can safely eat

solid food, but she does not conclude that her child can do the same, but she gives it milk food, and when in the course of time she wants it to learn to eat more solid victuals, she does not poke great chunks of bread and meat into its mouth. And so a catechist must treat his children." Rambach, p. 20.

From what has been said it is evident that we are advocating, what is technically termed the analytic process, in preference to the synthetic. The former assumes a given proposition, analyzes it into its component parts and then applies the proof-passages. The latter starts with the scripture passage, shows what it proves and sums up the proof into a proposition. The former analyzes, the latter develops or evolves a proposition. There may be cases where the synthetic process is quite serviceable. But it is the more difficult way of the two, requiring a very skillful catechist and especially bright children to carry it out successfully. "The synthetic way is much more difficult than the analytic, and none but a very experienced catechetist can follow it and reach the goal without stumbling or even breaking his legs. For the school the analytic way is the most appropriate, the shortest and safest. Teacher and scholars, by pursuing the analytic method, know exactly where they are going and how far they have gone, and the visible text before them is a guiding staff in their hands and keeps them from slipping and falling."—Lindemann, Schul-Praxis, p. 130.

There is some truth, however, in what Schuetze says: "Some text-books describe the two methods as being absolutely separate. In reality their relation to one another in the catechization is reciprocal, so that a well executed analysis includes synthesis, and vice versa, there is no synthesis without analysis. The evangelical catechization is not purely analytic nor purely synthetic, but by the very nature of its material, it is analytic-synthetic. The inseparableness

of the two methods is ingeniously expressed by Goethe: 'Analysis and Synthesis machen beide, wie Aus-und Einatmen, das Leben der Wissenschaft.'" Catechetics, p. 130.

We are here advocating the analytic method, and emphasize its use, not only as a preferable theory, but for a very practical purpose. Our church has stated doctrines, fixed dogmas. Our confessions are explicit, simple, complete and unalterable because they speak the truth. Every doctrine is a pearl brought out from the vast and deep ocean of God's revealed Word. The framers of our confessions, and above all the author of our catechism, were skillful, God-blessed divers, who overlooked no precious pearl. The string of gems which they have handed down to us in our confessions, is complete. Well may we analyze these dogmas. Well may we make them our starting point. Well may we accept them as true and explain them to old and young, and then apply God's Word and prove them true. "Synthesis" is a hard and difficult method. It was the life-work of Luther. How he longed for a foothold in his fearful struggle for the light and truth. Rome's dogmas were slippery and based upon falsehoods. How he toiled and prayed and fought, with none but his God to guide his footsteps aright. What a relief, what a help even his smaller catechism would have been to him, had it been placed into his hands in the early days of his inward struggle. But he had nothing save hi. Bible like a vast unexplored ocean before him. The charts which might have served him, the writings of the fathers, were substantially of little use to him, for what one taught the other denied, and the Pope had condemned the very truth he sought by burning as heretics those who taught it. Luther never knew that Huss had taught the truth of God in some things, until he had gone into the Scriptures and found it there first. This was "synthesis." Let us thank God that we have something to analyze, a clear and reliable statement of the chief parts of

Christian doctrine. Unionism cries out for synthesis. It wants no dogmas, no stated doctrines. It wants no charts for navigation. Let everybody make his own charts and find his own course. This accounts for the low grade of religious intelligence in sectarian churches. They are ever starting and never advancing, "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." 2 Tim. 3, 7. On the plea of guarding the right of private judgment, they refuse to profit by the labors of others. In their wonderful conceit they start out to find by laborious "synthesis" what has been found and might become their own property by the easy method of analysis. Oh, ye Lutherans, one and all, thank God for your precious catechism and make diligent use of it. Study it, analyze it, compare it with the Scriptures—that is but child's play compared with the herculean task of Luther who gathered it from the Scriptures. Shame on the pastor, the Sunday school superintendent or the Sunday school, who turn contemptuously from the catechism to the husks of sectarian knownothingism.

But we have digressed. Our love and admiration for the little gem of our church has led us into a warm plea for its dilligent use. It was the necessity of analyzing the proposition in the short explanation in order to get a clear, short and precise proposition in range with the proof-passage, that formed the subject of this paragraph. This is an imperative duty of the catechist if he would have his proof to be intelligible and convincing to his pupils. The short explanation is the text book. Its propositions have been obtained by an analysis of the text in the smaller catechism. It stands to reason that these propositions are still more or less condensed, often expressing quite a number of truths, for each of which a proof-passage is generally printed out in full or indicated by a mere mention of the book, chapter and verse where it may be found in the Bible. This brevity is natural, because the whole is but a short explanation. It is the cate-

chist's duty to separate these points and place them clearly and separately before the child's mind. Therefore he must analyze. Take for example question 41:

Question.—Why do we Christians no longer keep the seventh day of the week, as did the children of God in the Old Testament?

Answer.—Because God's children in the New Testament are no longer bound to a fixed day and to its legal observance.

To prove this we have three proof-passages printed in full. They prove the whole doctrine of Christian liberty, Col. 2, 16. 17. even being a sedes doctrinæ. They prove more than is in the question and answer, and there is more in the question and answer than is proven by the passages. This will certainly confuse the child, even the brightest catechumen, unless the teacher analyzes and brings out exactly what is proven.

The question contains two statements at least:

1. We Christians no longer keep the seventh day.
2. The children of God in the Old Testament kept the seventh day.

The answer contains these statements:

3. We Christians are God's children in the New Testament.
4. God's children in the Old Testament were bound to a fixed day.
5. The seventh day was a ‹ed day.
6. God's children in the Old Testament were bound to a legal observance of that fixed day.
7. God's children in the New Testament are not bound to a fixed day.
8. God's children in the New Testament are not bound to a legal observance of a fixed day.

Here we have eight distinct propositions. For some there is no proof added, because there is none needed. The

first the child knows to be true by actual experience. The second is a statement from Bible history. The third the child has been taught in question 1 of the short explanation. The fourth, fifth and sixth are statements from Bible history. The eighth virtually stands and falls with the seventh. The seventh is the point to be proven. It is stated in the answer, and yet, being associated as it is with a number of other statements, implications and allusions, it does not and cannot stand out as prominently before the child's mind as an independent point to be proven, as must be the case if the proof-passage is to have the desired effect. That to which the proof-passage has no reference should be eliminated and that to which it pertains should be set forth independent of all else. This may be done, as we have shown by an analysis of the text.

But it may be necessary for the catechist to resort to a process of logical deduction in order to get the proposition to which the proof-passages apply directly. Thus in question 41 and its answer we obtained by analysis the one proposition: The children of God in the New Testament are not bound to a fixed day. Not one of the proof-passages applies directly to this proposition as it stands. It is the conclusion of certain premises, and the passages apply to these premises. These premises must be found and proven, and when they are proven the child will draw the conclusion of its own accord, that the children of God in the New Testament are not bound to a fixed day. The whole train of reasoning by which this conclusion is reached is something like this:

God is the Lord of the Sabbath because He commanded the Sabbath, the seventh day, and made it a fixed day.

God's children are bound to obey His commands and therefore are bound to the day fixed by God.

God alone can revoke what He has commanded and

therefore He alone can release His children from the day which He has fixed.

God did not release His children from the Sabbath in the Old Testament and therefore they were bound.

But Christ, with whose advent the New Testament begins, is also Lord of the Sabbath (Matth. 12, 8) and therefore He can release the children of God from the Sabbath.

Christ did release the children of God from the Sabbath, or fixed day, by His fulfillment of all shadows and by His express Word. Col. 2, 16. 17.

Therefore, God's children in the New Testament are not bound to a fixed day.

Let no catechist expect his children to do all this reasoning of their own accord. It is his business to do it for his pupils, so that he may be able to submit to them the proposition to be proven in such a shape that the force of the proof-passages is apparent. The result of the process of deduction given above will be two propositions laid down by the teacher, two Scripture passages to prove them and a legitimate conclusion drawn by the children.

First proposition: Christ can release the children of God from the Sabbath or fixed day.

Proof: Math. 12, 6.

Second proposition: Christ did release the children of God in the New Testament from the Sabbath or fixed day.

Proof: Col. 2, 16. 17.

Conclusion: Therefore the children of God in the New Testament are no longer bound to a fixed day.

Again we ask the kind indulgence of the reader in behalf of our examples. Practice is always more difficult than theory. What we wanted to show was that the proposition to be proven should be brought "within range" of the proof-passage. This frequently requires a great deal of skill and hard labor on the part of the catechist. For this reason those

who catechize should prepare beforehand and, if at all possible, write out their catechizations. Before the children the whole work should be done by means of questions and answers strictly according to catechetical rules. The teacher must know exactly the point to be proven; he must prepare and know the way to that point, and by skillful questions lead the child up to the point. It would be folly to say anything to a child about analytic process and logical deductions. These are only the teacher's means of preparing the road. It may take all sorts of tools and machinery to cut a road through a dense forest, but when the road is finished a child can walk on it without knowing anything about the instruments. And so a skillful catechist will prepare a road and lead his children on it to the goal set before him, without bothering their minds about the ways and means. First of all, show the child what you wish to prove, and then apply the proof-passage.

THE PROOF-PASSAGE.

1. "Whatever is taught from the catechism must be proven by Scripture passages," says Rambach. "It must be impressed upon the children whenever there is an opportunity to do so, that God's Word is our only rule of faith and life, and that we must receive nothing except that which agrees with the Word." Rambach, p. 22. Cyrillus, of Jerusalem, addressed his catechumens thus: "You must not give your immediate assent when I affirm something, unless you are furnished with a proof from the Holy Scriptures." Rambach, p. 6. "In secular and natural things proofs may be adduced from reason; but in divine things this must never be done, because Christian faith is not based on natural knowledge, but on the special revelation of God; in matters of faith, Scripture proofs alone count."—Lindemann, Schul-Praxis, p. 122.

The necessity of Scripture proofs to prove doctrines of faith will hardly be questioned, but the importance of furnishing our children with such proofs and impressing these proofs upon their minds, is frequently overlooked. And yet it is the only way to impress them with the authority which the Holy Scriptures should have over their minds and hearts. "The Bible is the Word of God." This must be the major premise of every syllogism used to prove a Christian doctrine, and it ought to be firmly established in every Christian mind and heart. The catechist is greatly tempted to adduce proofs from reason, from nature, from secular history or from experience, because the child's mind seems to accept such proof with greater readiness than any other. So there is a temptation not to prove at all, but only to illustrate and explain, which again seems easier. But such negligence and convenience is dearly bought. The price is nothing less than the child's estrangement from the fountain of all proof. The child will grow up without a proper appreciation of the importance and respect for the authority of that, which should be its rule of faith and life, the Holy Scriptures. The child should not be trained to look upon the Bible as a mere history, or a story book, or a book of good morals, etc., but as the Word of the living God, every word of which is clothed with divine authority. "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but in words which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual." 1 Cor. 2, 13. There is a habit, a bent of the mind which is not natural but must be acquired, a willingness, a readiness, a sense of obligatoriness to submit to the written Word of God, which is a boon to him who has it. How sensitive Luther's mind was to any proof from the Holy Scriptures. He had an iron will in all other things, but with a scripture passage a little child could have conquered him. And that is the habit which all catechetical instruction must cultivate and strengthen or prove a miser-

able failure. Such a habit is formed, however, by constantly referring to the Holy Scriptures for proof. Lindemann is perfectly right when he says:

"Beware of all sorts of remarks, questions, applications, etc., which presume that the child can know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven 'by its own reason.' In a catechization on a word of the Gospel, there should be no socratizing. It is utterly wrong and most decidedly harmful to try to evolve doctrines of faith from reason, to seek to make them plausible to reason, to prove them by reason, or to treat them at all in a philosophical way. The Gospel is the only source of all saving revelation, and the only foundation of faith must always be: 'It is written.'"—Schul-Praxis, p. 116.

2. The proof-passage should prove the proposition as strikingly as possible. Let no catechist presume on the child's incapability of judging. Children will naturally confide in their teacher, and can, therefore, easily be imposed upon. But they will not always be children. They will some day sit in judgment on what you have taught them, and the consequences will be disastrous if they discover any fraud. Remember that the proofs which you submit to the child must convince the man. But they should convince the child, too. For this reason let them be as striking as possible. If a doctrine can be proven by a number of passages, choose the shortest and plainest. Passages that prove directly should be preferred to those that prove indirectly. But remember that they must prove the point in question. Proving power before brevity! The catechist should be so conscientious, that, although he knows that the child may never be able to read the original, he will submit no proof to his scholars of which he is convinced that the original does not sustain it. For this reason he who makes such selections of proof-passages, should be well versed in all the branches of theology, another evidence that the pastor should superintend the religious instruction of his children,

that given by parochial teachers not excepted. For this reason, too, it is well to have an authorized selection of proof-passages, it is well that we have a reliable catechism. Place Dietrich's catechism, or our own short explanation, which is based on Dietrich, in the hands of your children, and you may rest assured, the passage which convinces the child will also convince the man.

3. The proof-passage should be explained. The intellect must be reached first, then the will and the heart. A proof that is not intelligible will not convince. Explain the proof-passage before you apply it to the proposition to be proven.

The explanation should be necessary. A passage that need not be explained should be preferred to one that requires an explanation. Things that children may be expected to understand and that are self-evident need no explanation. Matters of faith should not be explained by human reasons; we should believe them. You cannot explain the Trinity, the personal union of the natures of Christ, the communication of attributes etc. They should be proven from the Scriptures and believed, they cannot be explained. "Seek not to explain everything, even that which is self-evident. Confine yourself to that which is necessary; a great deal can and will become clear to the child in after life only. Let every teacher beware of that mania to explain, which is in vogue here and there and is the result of rationalism."—Schul-Praxis, p. 118.

The explanation should be short. Almost every proof-passage will suggest some truth which may be aptly applied for "correction and instructio in righteousness," and the temptation is very great to make that application and forget the proof-process in which you are engaged. Good and wholesome as such an application may be, it is entirely out of place here, for it diverts the pupil's attention from the point of proof. Any explanation made should only serve to

bring out that point of proof. "In the sphere of catechetics, the prime object is not an explanation in general, but an explanation which has strict reference to the subject of the catechization."—Schuetze, Catechetics, p. 141. "Every explanation should be made as short as possible and in the most proper words. Every unnecessary word will confuse rather than make clear; and indefinite, obscure, improper words will produce fog rather than sunshine."—Schul-Praxis, p. 118.

4. The proof should be applied. Some passages are so clear and striking that the application can easily be made by the children themselves. It is well in such cases, and it will delight the children and make them attentive, if they are called upon to pick out the required passage. This may be successfully done, for instance, with the most passages under question 180 in the short explanation of our Synod. But when the application is too difficult for the children it should be made by the teacher. If the passage in question is a proof-passage at all, there is some connection between it and the proposition to be proven. To get the child to see this connection and to feel its effect is the very object of the whole process of proof. What good will your proposition and the work you spent upon it, and all your explanations of the proof-passage do you, if you fail to clinch the nail, that you have been driving, by showing the connection between the proposition and the passage, and emphasizing it and fastening it upon the pupil's mind? "The passages of Holy Scripture, which should serve as proof, must be of such a nature that they really and strikingly prove what they are expected to prove, for this reason they must be as short as possible; the shorter, the better. And it is not enough, simply to cite them, but they must also be made intelligible and applied to the proposition to be proven. As soon as the proposition is understood by the children, the proof passage, according to its contents, must be compared with the

proposition, and then that which is proven must be brought out clearly and definitely."—Schul-Praxis, p. 123.

5. Let no catechist forget that the success of his proof depends upon God's blessing, and God's blessing is given to those who ask. Let him apply all his skill of composition and rhetoric, and conform to all the rules of catechetics, it is God's Holy Spirit still who must carry conviction to the minds and hearts of his pupils. "Care should be taken," says Quintilian, "not that the hearer *may* understand, but that he *must* understand, whether he will or not." But Quintilian's rule does not hold in spiritual things. It is not human oratory or catechetical skill that can compel conviction in spiritual things, but "it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." Phil. 2, 13. "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves, to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God." 2 Cor. 3, 5. Bring all your knowledge of psychology and rhetoric and discourse and catechetics and theology to bear upon the process of proof that you are engaged in, but fail not, by a constant prayer in your heart, to ask God to bless your efforts and carry conviction to the young hearts before you. Catechetical instruction should be conducted in a prayerful, humble spirit. Let pupil and teacher know and feel that they are discussing divine and holy things, things that are far above our feeble comprehension, and yet which God in mercy has revealed to us and will enable us to understand by His Holy Spirit if we ask it in prayer for Jesus' sake. Let no catechist forget that the truths which he proves to his children are to be believed unto the salvation of the soul. This will make him conscientious and prevent him from shirking the hard labor which a good catechization will require, yea, it will make him humble enough to be a pupil with his pupils, to learn as he teaches and to pray, not for a cold and dead conviction only, but for a warm living faith in Jesus, which saves the soul.

"REMEMBER THE SABBATH DAY TO KEEP IT HOLY."

BY REV. E. H. D. WINTERHOFF, A. M., ANNA, O.

"And God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day." Genesis 1, 31. With these words the first chapter of Genesis closes the inspired record of the creation of all things.

On six successive days the fiat of omnipotence went forth; "He spake and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast." Ps. 33, 9. With the close of the sixth day God could say, It is finished, the work of creation is completed. What of the next day? How was it to be remembered? The sixth day having completed the work of creation, was it also to complete the days? Was the next day to be called the first day or the seventh day?

The second chapter of Genesis introduces to us the next day as the *seventh* day, and dwells upon it with special emphasis. "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made." Genesis 2, 1-3.

It is therefore undeniable that from the very beginning the seventh day was remarkably distinguished from all other days, and received a special stamp of "Holiness unto the Lord." It also appears that a knowledge of the sanctity of the seventh day survived the fall of man, and that holy men of God kept this day with religious observance before the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai, in the ante-diluvian period as well as in the post-diluvian period.

In the fourth chapter of Genesis we are told that Cain and Abel, earth's first sin-born creatures, brought an offering unto the Lord. When? "In process of time," says our English Bible; "At the end of days," says the Hebrew. Though we are aware that this passage is hardly decisive, yet we are not ready to judge the opinion of those as utterly unfounded who believe this offering to have taken place on the seventh day, and that here may be found a trace of an observance of the Sabbath day, which reaches into the very beginning of human history.

In the inspired record of the deluge the seven-day period plays a prominent part. It would appear as though it was the seventh day, when the Lord communed with Noah, instructing him to enter the ark; that it was on the seventh day, when the windows of heaven were opened, and the fountains of the great deep were broken up. Certainly it was always after an interval of seven days, when Noah sent forth the dove.

Now let us turn to Exodus, 16. The event narrated in this chapter occurred before the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai. The children of Israel murmured, because they had nothing to eat. "Then said the Lord unto Moses, Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law, or no. And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily." Exodus 16, 4. 5. This promise was literally fulfilled. The manna fell regularly every morning for six successive days. "And they gathered it every morning, every man according to his eating: and when the sun waxed hot, it melted. And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which

the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning. And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade: and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein. And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord: to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none. And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day." Exodus 16, 21-30.

We should neither ignore nor fear these traces of the Sabbath and its observance. Some try hard to make it appear as though the Sabbath day was neither known nor kept by the Jews before the giving of the Law, and then use such an assumption as an argument for the temporary and ceremonial character of the Sabbath and for the New Testament liberty from its observance. We fail to see the force and the importance of such an argument, even in case the assumption were tenable. The fact is, if the New Testament does not plainly and explicitly establish the Christian's freedom from the Jewish Sabbath day, and its legal observance, then its observance is still divinely obligatory; but if we are so taught, then we are free in this respect, no matter whether the seventh day was observed not only before the giving of the Law, but even by Adam and Eve in Paradise.

On the other hand, it must be maintained, that, though the Sabbath day was known, and to some extent also ob-

served previous to the giving of the Law, there was no definite command given to man, that he should keep the seventh day and how he should keep it, until the Lord descended in fire upon Mount Sinai. Then God spake with the awful majesty of the divine Lawgiver: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Exodus 20, 9-11. Thus the Sabbath day, together with the manner of its observance, became a divine institution. Death was the threatened penalty against the violators of this law. "Ye shall keep the Sabbath, therefore; for it is holy unto you. Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death." Exodus 31, 14.

Numbers 15, 32-36. furnishes us with an instance of how this penalty was inflicted.

Such is the early history of the Sabbath day, and such the origin of the third commandment—of that commandment taught unto us also in our catechism: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy."

Why then do we not observe the Sabbath day? Why do we not heed the command of God: "In it thou shalt not do any work," and again, "Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitation upon the Sabbath day"? Exodus 35, 3.

Our Catechism says, "Because God's children in the New Testament are no longer ound to a fixed day and to its legal observance." That is a sweeping assertion, and must needs be thoroughly substantiated and verified by plain and unmistakable declarations of God's own infallible Word.

We affirm then, and mean to prove, that the third commandment contains both moral and ceremonial features; that the former are binding for all times, and the latter not; that the fixed day and its legal observance belong to the ceremonial part of this law and are therefore done away with in the New Testament.

I.

1. It should be borne in mind, that in case the law commanding the observance of the seventh day be still in force, then also the law determining the manner of its observance would be still in force; then also the penalty of death should to this day be executed against all violaters of this Mosaic law. To make this feasible, a New Testament theocracy must prevail, similar to that of the Old Testament. That is exactly what Rome wants and claims with her two swords. Are our Sabbatarians ready to carry out the inevitable conclusion of their own premises?

2. But the New Testament teaches plainly and explicitly, that the Sabbath days of the Jews belong to the shadows of the Old Testament which have passed away with the appearance of the body which is Christ.

"Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of the holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. 2, 16. 17. In this passage St. Paul places meat, drink, holy day, new moon, Sabbath days on the same level, as Old Testament ordinances belonging into the same category. He exhorts his Christians at Colosse, that they shall permit no man to judge them in respect of these ordinances. They are shadows of things to come, but the body is of Christ. Being shadows of a promised body they are valuable as a propædeutic factor

and as long as the promised body itself has not appeared. Christ Jesus is this promised body. He has come; He is here. What folly, then, to still cling to shadows in a legalistic spirit. It is worse than folly; it is sin; it is ingratitude; it is depreciating and rejecting the body.

By placing the laws concerning meat and Sabbath days side by side, the Apostle teaches us the true relation, which Christians sustain to these ordinances. We have entire freedom with respect to them. We have liberty to observe the Sabbath days, and liberty not to observe them; just as we have liberty to eat pork, and liberty not to eat pork. We may do the one, or not do the other, and in either case serve God, or in either case serve the devil. If we observe the day, or do not observe the day, in the Lord, in faith, in the true evangelical spirit of Christian liberty, then we serve God. "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks." Rom. 14, 5. 6.—If we observe the day, or do not observe the day in doubt, or in a legalistic spirit, we serve Satan. "He that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14, 23.

He therefore who maintains the Mosaic Sabbath law as obligatory on Christians should take heed, lest he lust after—"Ham and eggs."

3. It is a grave and dangerous error to maintain the permanence and inviolability of this Mosaic law; for by honoring these shadows as still in force, we thereby place ourselves again under the bondage and curse of the Law. By acknowledging the Sabbath's reign over us we ignore

the body, Christ Jesus, who has come "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross." Col. 2, 14.

It is for this reason that St. Paul pleads so earnestly with the Galatians, who had been troubled by false prophets and by them had partly been removed from the true Gospel unto a perverted Gospel, which was not another Gospel, but in reality again the bondage of the Law. "But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." Gal. 4, 9-11. It is for this reason that he encourages his wavering soldiers in those stirring words, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Gal. 5, 1.

Jesus declared Himself as Lord even of the Sabbath day. As such He had the power to free us from its bondage. St. Paul teaches us that Christ exercised this power unto our salvation. Ours is the duty to preserve our Christian liberty.

4. But we are free not only from the Jewish Sabbath day, but also from any fixed day. There is no divine obligation placed upon us to religiously observe any fixed day, neither the seventh day nor any in seven days. We are unable to see the force and consistency of those, venerable and learned though they be, who argue that though we are no longer bound to a legal observance of the seventh day, yet we are still under constraint to observe one day in seven. Where is that written? The seventh day, and the seventh day only, is of divine institution. It is abrogated in the New Testament. No other day has been divinely instituted in its place. Hence we must declare ourselves entirely free

with respect to the religious observance of any fixed day. Whosoever attempts to substitute, as divinely obligatory, another day for the Jewish Sabbath day, falls under the same condemnation with the Galatians, "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." Gal 4, 10. 11.

II.

Having demonstrated, as we believe, that the above quoted answer of our Catechism is well entrenched in God's Word, the question naturally and justly arises: *If these things are so, why do we still teach the third commandment?* We still have printed in our Catechism, as the third commandment, the words, "Remember the Sabbath to keep it holy."

1. We answer, because the *essence* of the third commandment still remains, and is in force also in the dispensation of the New Testament.

The seventh day was merely a form, merely a shadow, and has passed away; but the true aim and object, the *moral* part, of this law, to wit: the pointing of the shadow to the body—Christ, the hearing and teaching and obeying of God's Word, it remains, and is divinely obligatory on all men to the end of time.

The holy ministry is of divine institution. Jesus solemnly charged His disciples, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." Mark 16, 15. 16. He also instituted the Holy Supper, and gave the order, "This do in remembrance of me." Luke 22, 19. Hence it is the expressed will and command of our Sav r, that the Gospel be preached and the holy sacraments administered. And, of course, when God speaks, whether audibly through the preaching of His Word, or audibly and visibly through the administration of the holy sacraments, it is man's duty to listen and obey.

"Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for the Lord hath spoken." Isaiah 1, 2. "Speak, Lord; for thy servant heareth." 1 Sam. 3, 9. "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therfore hear them not, because ye are not of God." John 8, 47. "Be ye doers of the Word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves." James 1, 22. It is therefore the imperative duty of the followers of Christ, not only rightly to administer the means of grace, but also rightly and diligently to use the same. This was the substance of the third commandment even in the Old Testament (compare Is. 1, 10-20); and this substance of the third commandment has been re-enforced in the New Testament, and therefore we properly and truly teach the third commandment to this day. For this reason Luther, in his matchless exposition of the third commandment, speaks of the moral part of this law only, when he says: "We should fear and love God, that we may not despise preaching and His Word; but hold it sacred and gladly hear and learn it."

2. Now since God desires that everything be done decently and in order, 1 Cor. 14, 40. it is certainly in accord with the divine mind, that Christians set a fixed day, and agree on a certain time when they will come together for the purpose of preaching and hearing the Word, and of administering and using the holy sacraments. For well-known reasons the church in Christian liberty gradually adopted for this purpose the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday. It is true, that for some time in those early days the Gospel was preached especially also on the Sabbath day; but that day was then used not as a divine institution, but as a missionary expediency. That the Gospel of Christ Jesus might reach the ears of the Jews, the apostles and their disciples met them in their synagogues on the Sabbath day.

Sunday, then, is not a divine institution, but an appointment of the church. We observe Sunday not as under the

bondage of a law, but as under the dispensation of Gospel liberty. We rest on Sunday, and abstain from our daily toil, and hasten to God's house not because it is Sunday, but because the Word of God is preached then and there.

The obligatory observance of the *seventh* day in the Old Testament, and the free-will observance of the *first* day in the New Testament furnish us with a striking and beautiful illustration of the character of these two covenants. The Jew, wearied by six days of toil under the taskmaster of the Law, finally, on the *last* day, sought peace and rest in the promised Messiah—in Him who was to invite: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Matth. 11, 28. The Christian, resting in God and refreshing his soul with pardon, love and grace on the *first* day of the week, in the strength of this grace runs gladly the way of God's commandments the rest of the week.

3. Since by common consent Christians assemble in their respective houses of worship on the first day of the week for the above stated purpose, the inspired admonition in the letter to the Hebrews comes home to every disciple of Christ. "And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works: not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching." Hebrews 10, 24. 25.

Under existing circumstances to rebel against the proper observance of the Christian Sunday with a boasting assertion of Christian liberty would do violence to that spirit of meekness and charity which is to grace the followers of Jesus, and, on the other hand, would manifest a spirit of arrogant presumption hich abuses liberty for a cloak of maliciousness.

As Christian citizens we should, of course, hail with delight all true and righteous state laws that aid and protect us in our public worship on the Lord's day, provided that

such laws do not infringe upon the principles of liberty and charity. The state certainly has no right to pass and enforce laws concerning the *religious* observance of Sunday or any other day. As soon as it undertakes to do that, it dabbles in affairs for which it has neither calling nor qualification. For this reason the agitators of the National Reform party in this respect must be resented as dangerous and as antagonistic to the fundamental principles of our glorious republic. It is not the business of the state to look after the spiritual welfare of its subjects. It is, however, its business to look after their temporal welfare. Therefore, if the state finds it expedient and necessary for the temporal prosperity of the commonwealth that one day of the seven be set apart as a day of rest and recreation, it certainly has the right to legislate accordingly.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." We should, therefore, well discriminate; thoroughly understand and zealously guard the principle, that though the state has the right to legislate concerning the *secular* observance of a certain day, it has no right to legislate concerning the *religious* observance of Sunday or any other day.

We close this discussion in the following words of the 28th article of our peerless Augustana: "What is then to be thought of the Lord's day, and of like church rites? To this ours answer, that bishops or pastors are allowed to make ordinances, so that things may be done orderly in the church; not that by them we may merit grace, or satisfy for sins, or that men's consciences should be bound to esteem them as necessary services, and think that they sin when they violate them without offending others. So Paul ordains that women should cover their heads in the congregation, 1 Cor. 11, 6; that the interpreters of Scripture should be heard in order, in the church, 1 Cor. 14, 27-30. Such ordinances it behooves the churches, for the sake of charity and peace, to keep, to this extent that one do not offend

another, that all things may be done in order and without tumult in the church, 1 Cor. 14, 40; comp. Phil. 2, 14; but so that the consciences be not burdened, so as to deem them things necessary to salvation, and think they sin when they violate them, without offending others: as no one will say that a woman sins, if she goes in public with her head uncovered, provided no one is offended. Such is the observance of the Lord's day, of Easter, of Pentecost, and like holidays and rites. For they err greatly that think that by the authority of the church the observance of the Lord's day has been instituted instead of the Sabbath, as necessary. The Scripture has abrogated the Sabbath, and teaches that all Mosaical ceremonies may be omitted, after the Gospel is revealed. And yet, because it was necessary to appoint a certain day, in order that the people might know when they ought to come together, it appears that the church for that purpose appointed the Lord's day; which for this cause also seems to have been preferred, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the observance neither of the Sabbath nor of another day is necessary."

A SHORT HISTORY OF PIETISM.

BY REV. P. A. PETER, WEST BALTIMORE, O.

During the controversies mentioned in the preceding chapter, a remarkable change was taking place. Hitherto the Orthodox party had been the assailant, and the Pietist party the defendant. But now the latter began to accuse the former of departing from the pure doctrine of the Church. The Pietists were conscious of their ability to better successfully cope with their antagonists. Another remarkable change was this: Up to this time, the leadership

of Orthodoxy had been in comparatively weak hands. Not one of the orthodox leaders could be compared to such able and worthy men, as Spener and Francke. Now the tables were turned and the Pietists came to the front with such bold and aggressive men as Joachim Lange and others.

Valentin Ernst Löscher, a theologian, equal in true piety and active Christianity to Spener, but superior to him in erudition and intellectual endowments, became the leader of the orthodox party. Lange was a learned man, but intellectually much inferior to Löscher. In controversy, Lange was coarse, bitter, impulsive and passionate. The controversy between Orthodoxy and Pietism centered in these two men. The cause of Orthodoxy could not have been committed to a better champion than the former. It is surprising that the cause of Pietism was not espoused by a better champion than Lange. He was indeed an earnest and a zealous defender of his cause, but certainly such worthy and respectable theologians as August Hermann Francke, could not approve the manner in which Lange conducted the controversy. But Francke suffered Lange to do as he pleased in this new conflict with Löscher.

Joachim Lange was born in Gardelegen, September 26, 1670. In his early life, he was greatly influenced in religious matters by his brother, who was ten years older than himself, and who was a pious student of theology. Joachim commenced his studies at Leipzig in 1689, and at once took a warm interest in the *Collegia philobiblica*, which had been instituted at the University. Francke received him very cordially and made him his companion. At Leipzig he also became intimately acquainted with all those men, who in later years became his associates in Halle, Anton and Michaelis, besides Francke. He also entered into friendly relations with Thomasius. He even became private tutor to his children and gained his confidence to such a degree that when Thomasius deemed it

advisable to flee from Halle, in order to be absent from an investigation instituted against himself, he (Lange), was the only person, who knew anything of Thomasius' flight. The troubles at Leipzig in consequence of Pietism, in 1690, determined Lange to leave that city and go to Erfurt, where he attended Francke's and Breithaupt's lectures, and afterwards followed them to Halle. In 1693 he went to Berlin, where he was cordially received by Schade. He became private tutor to the children of the Baron Canitz, who was known as a patron of the Pietists. Lange also took an active part in the *Collegium biblicum* that was conducted by Spener with the students twice a week. Lange became a very successful educator, who not only taught his pupils the sciences in a very thorough manner, but also sought to bring them up in Christian piety and a holy life. Many of his pupils became good theologians and pastors.

In 1709 Lange went to Halle, as Professor in ordinary, of Theology, and labored in perfect agreement with Francke, Breithaupt, Paul Anton and Michaelis, until his death, which occurred in 1744. He was the most active among all the Professors in a literary capacity. He wrote a large commentary on the Bible,"Licht und Recht", was very active as a prominent leader of the Pietists, and published a great number of controversial writings. His activity was very great until about 1730, when his influence began to wane, as Pietism had passed its time of bloom.

Instead of taking the defensive in the pietistical controversy of his time, Lange assumed the offensive. He accused the antagonists of Pietism of acting deceitfully,—of being pseudo-orthodox. He said that they had made unto themselves an idol of pretended orthodoxy and hypocrisy. He even affirmed that they aught pernicious heresies, perverting the Scriptures and the symbolical books, and declared that they were described in 2 Tim. 3, 1-5. He accused the enemies of Pietism of rank Pelagianism, because

they taught that an unconverted person can properly and correctly preach and expound the Word of God when his teaching agrees with the literal sense of its words and phrases. He also declared that Pelagianism was at the bottom of the pseudo-orthodox conception of justification as in agreement with this idea, justifying faith was not active but inactive. According to Lange, Pelagianism was the ruling principle of the so-called orthodox doctrine concerning *adiaphora*, according to which lust is not sin.

Lange repaid the former attacks of the orthodox party upon the Pietists, with full interest. He threw all the accusations against Pietism upon the champions of Orthodoxy, and said that they led many sincere but simple souls into doubt and indifference. He denied all the charges concerning fanaticism and religious enthusiasm, which had been made against the Pietists and defended their measures for promoting piety and virtue. He did not deny that in some instances Pietists had been guilty of irregularities, but declared that they were not to be blamed for Separatism and sectarianism. Lange was as vehement in defending Pietism, as its opposers had been in attacking it. Lange's manner in carrying on this controversy was certainly censurable, inasmuch as so worthy and respectable an opponent as Löscher, now appeared as the defender of true Orthodoxy.

Valentin Ernst Löscher was born at Sondershausen, December 29, 1673, and was trained under the influence of orthodox teachers. His attitude against Pietism was entirely different from that of the majority of the opposers of the new movement. He was free from fanatical prejudices and entirely fair-minded, judicious and moderate.

Löscher was engaged in philosophical and historical studies at the University of Wittenberg, from 1690 to 1694. In the latter year he went to Jena, where he remained some time and studied theology. Upon his return to Witten-

berg, in September 1694, after a long journey through Germany, he began his theological lectures, earnestly defending the pure doctrines of the Lutheran Church. He carefully studied the developments of Pietism, comparing it with similar movements in the past, especially those of a mystical character. In 1698 he was called as Superintendent to Jüterbock, where he devoted himself with all his great gifts and splendid endowments to the duties of his office, to the Church, and to pure theology. His pastoral office was the central point of his activity, and whilst faithfully discharging his ministerial duties, he became well acquainted with the religious wants of the people. In 1701 he was called as Pastor and Superintendent to Delitzsch, and after the death of Deutschmann accepted a call in 1707, to Wittenberg, as Professor of Theology. In 1709 he was called as Pastor to the Holy Cross Church, Superintendent and member of the Consistory.

In company with other theologians, Löscher founded the first theological journal, "Unschuldige Nachrichten von alten und neuen theologischen Sachen", in 1701. This periodical contained many important articles on religious and theological topics in the history of the Church, and discussions on the issues of the day, affecting the Church. The general tendency of the journal was in opposition to Pietism, but more particularly in opposition to Separatism and fanaticism. The general tone of the articles was calm and moderate, without offensive personalities and bitter discussions. Spener and Francke were mentioned with great respect. The attacks of the journal were chiefly directed against such Mystics as Arnold, Dippel and others. A proper distinction was made between sober-minded Pietists and fanatics. It was freely admitted that the condition of the Church at that time was in many respects a deplorable one. It was also admitted, that the thorough study of the Bible had been shamefully neglected, and val-

uable suggestions were made to improve the study of Theology. In 1703 an article, entitled "Pia desideria" appeared in this periodical, similar in contents to Spener's tract bearing the same name. Both had the same purpose in view, to-wit, the improvement of the Church and Christian life, but the means and measures to be employed in obtaining these desirable results, were entirely different.

Löscher was well aware that there were evils in the life of the Church, that loudly called for correction. He suggested that ministers should attend to their duties with more earnestness and diligence, both publicly and privately, that they should incite each other to more zeal and activity in their holy calling and often meet together in conferences for mutual instruction and encouragement, and introduce stricter discipline into their congregations. He said that students of theology should be placed under a more faithful and watchful care, and that church-visitations should be held oftener than was customary. He earnestly admonished all pastors to beware more particularly of covetousness and ambition, to exercise themselves more in caring for souls, preaching truly edifying sermons, and establishing more intimate relations between themselves and the members of their congregations.

It is evident from what has been said that Löscher believed that many great improvements were necessary in life and conduct, and that he deplored as much as Spener and Francke, the evils of the times. He sincerely lamented the evident want of a warmer, more cordial, sincere and truly pious Christian life among all classes of the people, and was sorry to see the careless, negligent and carnal manner in which many ministers attended to their duties. He earnestly and boldly denounced the formalism, spiritual slothfulness, carnality, and all the crying evils of the day; but at the same time declared it was not necessary to adopt new and peculiar measures, such as the Pietists had intro-

duced, to remove these evils, for the Church already possessed the proper means to heal all injuries, namely the pure Word and Sacraments.

Whilst Löscher deeply lamented the fact that religion had largely become a mere external matter with so many persons, and that a more internal and spiritual religion was necessary for a higher and better Christian life, he did not believe that the means and measures of the Pietists were the best agencies for effecting the desired results. The Pietists had often been accused of Mysticism. Löscher did not condemn Mysticism, but the Mysticism he held was orthodox; religion, he said, was not a mere historical knowledge of the truth, and a correct external deportment, but a matter of the heart, as well as of the mind. He declared that it was necessary to make a distinction between true and false Mysticism. It was false, when the Word of God was considered as something external, and when the Church, the ministry, the sacraments and public worship were looked upon as merely external and indifferent things, and set in opposition to spiritual truths.

A long and tedious controversy now ensued and it soon became manifest that Lange was no match for his learned opponent. Löscher was very thorough in his judgments and criticisms on Pietism, as well as moderate in expressing his opinions, whilst upon the other hand, Lange was not able to answer Löscher and indulged in offensive personal remarks against his opponent. Löscher tried to bring about a true peace between the contending parties, but was unsuccessful in his well-meant efforts.

In 1695 Deutschmann, of Wittenberg, published against the Pietists, his "*Christlutherische Vorstellung*," in which he enumerated 283 heresies and false doctrines in their doctrinal system, but this publication made little impression. Ten years afterwards, Loescher's "*Timotheus Verinus*" appeared and met with a good reception. Bern-

hard Riggenbach says in Schaff-Herzog's Encyclopedia, Art. Pietism, in Vol. 3, p. 1841: "Löscher accused the Pietists of being indifferent to the truths of revelation such as systematized in the symbolical books; of depreciating the sacraments and the ministerial office; of obscuring the doctrine of justification by asserting that good works were necessarily connected with saving faith, its evidence, indeed; of favoring novelties by their predilection for enthusiastic eccentricities, and their neglect of existing customs; and he altogether rejected those chiliastic, terministic and perfectionistic doctrines which had developed among them. Almost at every point there was some reason for the opposition of Löscher; and, while the Pietists often became offensive to other people on account of their extravagances, Löscher was by no means a mere dogmatist; on the contrary, he advocated the cause of practical piety almost with as much warmth as the Pietists themselves."

The controversy between Lange and Löscher was protracted and exceedingly violent and bitter on the part of the former. A disputation was arranged to take place at Merseburg, May 10th, 1719, but nothing came of it.

As a distinct religious movement Pietism had run its course about the middle of the eighteenth century. Spener's work made itself felt, more or less, in the whole Lutheran Church. It gave a new impetus to Biblical study and practical Christianity. It made religion a matter of the heart as well as of the mind, and applied it to every day life. It defined and asserted the rights and privileges of the laity in the Church, and showed the duties and obligations of the members of the congregations. It inaugurated extensive missionary operations, and called into life many noble institutions of Christian benevolence. It was not without its defects. In many respects it was narrow and legalistic, and lacked the firmness and consistency, the boldness and cheer-

fulness, of the faith of Luther. It had a singular predilection for new means and ways to advance the cause of the Church, and too often ran into deplorable eccentricities and wild extravagances.

No doubt, the intentions of conservative Pietists were well-meant and their influence good. Riggenbach says: "Nevertheless, the fundamental ideas of Spener and his friends were too truly Christian, and too intimately related to the very principles of the Reformation, not to find a wide acceptance. In less than half a century Pietism spread its influence through all spheres of life, and through all classes of society; and when, after the accession of Frederick II., it had to give way, in Northern Germany, to the rising Rationalism, it found a new home in Southern Germany. What Spener, Francke, Anton, Breithaupt and others had been to Prussia and Saxony, Bengel, Weismann, Oetinger, Hahn and others were to Württemberg and Baden. Indeed, the older school of Tübingen was principally based on Pietism."—Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, Art. Pietism, Vol. III., p. 1841.

When considering the character and practical effects of this remarkable movement in the Lutheran Church, we can well agree with Riggenbach, who says in the work already mentioned (p. 1840): "Pietism denotes a movement in the Lutheran Church which arose as a re-action of the living, practical faith which demands to express itself in every act of the will, against an orthodoxy which too often contented itself with the dead, theoretical correctness of its creed. At present it is not uncommon to find all the various phenomena of asceticism, mysticism, quietism, separatism, etc. lumped together under the common designation of pietism; but so vague a definition is detrimental to the precise understanding of history. On the other hand, the old definition of pietism, as a mere protest against a stiff and barren ortho-

doxy, is too narrow. Pietism had deep roots in the Lutheran Church; it grew from the very principles of the Lutheran Reformation; and it would, no doubt, have developed, even though there had been no orthodoxy to re-act upon. The personal development of Spener before his public work began in 1670, assimilating, as it did a great number of various influences, is one evidence. Another is the effect of his work, which was by no means spent with the end of the pietistic controversies at the death of Löscher, in 1747."

I am greatly indebted to Prof. Heinrich Schmid's excellent "Geschichte des Pietismus"; Nœrdlingen, 1863, in preparing this sketch for the pages of this Magazine.

WHAT DOES THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACH CONCERNING WOMAN'S SOCIAL POSITION IN CHRISTENDOM?

BY PROF. DR. NOESGEN OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ROSTOCK.

(Translated by Rev. F. W. Abicht, Sulphur Springs, Ohio.)

In practical and public life there are many questions which are seemingly little connected with the inner religious life. And yet their correct solution demands that they be considered on the basis of Christian-ethical principles. These mark, as it were, the path of Christian consideration; and discussion on any other basis is apt to lead into erroneous and anti-Christian by-ways. This is true also of the woman question which is becoming more and more a burning one. No doubt, many features of it, of great importance socially considered, can be correctly judged from merely politic-economical, technical, local and temporary points of view. The conditions of the times be-

ing totally changed, it would even be entirely out of place and misleading to decide these on the ground of biblical analogies. But the question as a whole, the answer to which conditions the solution of all the particulars of the woman's rights question, is that concerning the correct social position of woman within Christendom. What callings and occupations she may pursue, whether she should have the right of suffrage, and other matters, can be correctly decided only after clearness and certainty have been attained in the question stated above. According as this social position is conceived, the scope, within which particular demands in the minor details of the question are to be considered, will be quite different.

On account of the influence of the Gospel the position of woman in Christendom has become an entirely different one from that of the non-Christian nations. But this change has hitherto been confined to her position in the family and matters more closely connected with the home. True, a few extensions of woman's conceded sphere of activity have for some time past gradually gained recognition. But for a decade and a half the call for the emancipation of woman from existing social fetters of her sex has become stronger, and repeatedly have utterances been made which demand that woman be considered entirely equal to man, socially considered, where practical or sanitary considerations do not make it evidently impracticable —and all this on the ground of principle and in the name of gospel liberty. It is no longer an outspoken anti-Christian tendency which makes these demands; but men who are really or pretendedly zealous for the complete *evangelical* transformation of our present social conditions are expressing a willingness to yield, step by step, to those cries for social emancipation within the wo.an's world. Even men who claim a reputation in social philosophy and are entitled to it, have entered the ranks; and hence we deem it our duty

to determine from the New Testament, whether it can be demanded or conceded on the ground of the Gospel, that woman's social position in Christendom should now become a different one than in the past nineteen centuries of the Christian era, and whether it be proper and expedient for her to be considered man's equal with regard to all social conditions.

For every truly evangelical Christian it remains a settled fact that, if the New Testament expresses a principle with regard to even one phase of the woman's rights question, the solution of the question must be taken from the New Testament, and that the decision and opinion of even the highest human authority cannot weaken the testimony of the Word. Not all of Holy Writ, but only the New Testament, enters into our consideration, because this is a question of evangelical liberty. The decisive answer to such a question can be sought and found only in the verbal and actual testimony of the Lord and His apostles. This shall now be done.

The Word of God again proves its sufficiency in all questions pertaining to salvation, and to the religious and ethical preservation on the right path. It exhibits not only the inner necessity of regarding woman as man's equal through Christ and how far this may be done, but shows also the boundary where the evangelical and unevangelical treatment of many details in this question diverge; and this, too, in spite of the fact that it speaks of such things only casually and incidentally.

In the first place, the preaching of the Gospel in the New Testament in its very beginning clearly distinguishes itself from that of the law by its universality. The Gospel's development in the world could of necessity take none other than an historical course, and hence in the beginning it could be proclaimed only in Israel (Matth. 15, 24; Acts 1, 8; Luke 24, 48). But from the very beginning it was without dis-

tinction addressed to both men and women. "Come unto me, *all* ye that labor and are heavy-laden!" is an unconditional invitation of the Lord. That it is such, is evident from the fact that Christ publicly assures the sinful woman of the forgiveness of her sins (Luke 7, 48) as well as the man stricken with the palsy (Matth. 9, 2); and He recognizes the greatness of faith in the Syro-Phoenician woman no less than in the centurion of Capernaum (Matth. 8, 10). He commands baptism to be administered not only to the male portion of the human race, but to all in all nations (Matth. 28, 19). After the full development of the New Testament dispensation, beginning with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, it is still more evident that in this dispensation differences or nationality and position and sex were not taken into consideration. The express declaration of St. Paul that in Christ there is neither male nor female, but all one in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3, 28), is being confirmed from all sides ever since the Gospel has begun to spread over all the earth. The most fruitful beginnings of congregations were made by the conversions of men as well as of women, Lydia at Philippi (Acts 16, 14. 15), Damaris at Athens (Acts 17, 34), Lois and Eunice at Lystra (2 Tim. 1,5; com. Acts 16, 1) and Priscilla, the wife of Aquila, at Corinth and Ephesus (Acts 18, 2; 19, 26; Rom. 16, 3). And the Spirit of God is poured out not only on God's servants and handmaidens, as Joel had prophesied (Joel 2, 29), but dispenses His gracious gifts, like that of prophecy, equally to men and women (Acts 2, 18; 1 Cor. 14, 34), so that it could even come to pass that a woman in Thyatira abused the prophetic gift (Rev. 2, 20). Already in the case of the women who served the Lord (Luke 8, 3) we see the inner cordial attachment expel the fear of His enemies more successfully than in the men, the former abiding with the crucified one to the last (Matth. 27, 56. 61; 28, 1), while even the twelve abandoned Him, wherefore the women also enjoyed the pref-

erence of seeing the arisen Christ before the men (Matth. 28, 8-10; Luke 24, 9. 10; John 10, 19). The frequent recognition of women in the apostolic greetings (Rom. 16, 1. 6. 12. 15; Phil. 4, 2; Philem. v. 2; 2 John v. 1. 13) goes to show that the female members of the church were equal to the male in the eyes of the apostles. Thus we find in the New Testament the fullest equality of both sexes with regard to the way of salvation and the state of grace.—As woman in the new covenant fully shares all the treasures of salvation, the duty with regard to their preservation is equally binding on her. In the second epistle of John she is enjoined to exercise care over herself and hers, that they walk in the truth and remain in the things which they heard, in order that they be not led astray from the doctrine received and that they might not lose that which had been wrought in them (2 John v. 6. 8). It is hardly necessary to state that the whole testimony of John demanded steadfastness in doctrine, not only as regards the intellectual acceptation, but also the activity of faith in the whole walk of life. This apostle's admonition to a woman is in fullest harmony with the fact that already in the first periods of the first church the honor of a female disciple was found in being rich in good works and alms (Acts 9, 36); on the other hand, in the first case of discipline in this congregation a woman who with her husband had lied to the Holy Spirit received equal punishment with him (Acts 5, 9. 10). In all these cases the apostles entirely followed their Master, who praised Mary of Bethany as well for sitting at His feet and hearing His word (Luke 10, 39. 41), as for anointing Him with the costly oil of spikenard (Mark 14, 6).

Since the Lord looketh on the heart, there is in the New Testament no respect of persons with regard to either nationality or sex (Acts 10, 34). In the kingdom of His Son, which, though not belonging to the earth, has come upon it, woman is entirely equal to man.

II.

And yet everywhere in the New Testament this equality has its boundary and undergoes a most significant limitation, as soon as such matters in the congregation of Christ enter into the discussion, which have their root in the fact that this congregation is yet in the world, even if not of the world; in the fact that it belongs to a perishable and incomplete creation, in which it is to labor. This is proven by the Lord's own conduct as well as by His apostles' actions and directions.

As mentioned above, the Lord accepted services of women (Luke 8, 3), and considered such a service a good work (Mark 14, 6). He even tolerates and sanctions that a woman makes good a neglect of a man (Luke 7, 44. 45.). Nevetheless He never commands a woman to follow Him in the special sense as He does Matthew and the rich youth (Matth. 4, 14; 9, 9.; 19, 21.), The sending out of the seventy (Luke 10, 1) besides that of the twelve shows that He burned with zeal to execute His Father's will at the proper time for harvest and with all available forces; He even commands the apostles to pray for laborers in the harvest (Matth. 9, 37. 38.). Nevertheless, although the Israelite women were by no means insusceptible for His Gospel, the thought is far removed from Him, to establish for them something like the Zenana mission.* At His departure from the earth He likewise addresses His missionary command to the whole of His congregation of disciples (Matth. 28, 19; Luke 24, 46-48);

* The author does not in any manner wish even to indicate any scruples concerning the Zenana mission. As far as he knows, it has thus far progressed in approved channels. Witnessing of faith and winning souls among the fellow members of the household and within the circle of acquaintances is the duty of every Christian and hence also of every woman. The position of women in the Orient fully justifies that qualified Christian women tender them medical aid and use such intercourse as ways and means of bringing them

but as instruments through which the church should execute this command He chooses and empowers only men (Luke 24, 48; Acts 1, 2; John 15, 16. 19).

As regards the position of women in Christendom, the conduct of Jesus toward His mother may, even if only secondarily, be taken into account. There are especially two of His utterances which should be considered, because in these her sex is taken into account. At the wedding of Cana, when she offered Him her suggestion regarding the social embarrassment of the bridal home, He rejected it with the words, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" (John 2, 4). Mary's error did not consist in this that she expected aid of her son even in such a case. That she did not deem herself disappointed in such expectattion, is evident from the fact that even after her suggestion was rejected, she told the servants, "Whatsoever He saith unto you, do it." (John 2, 5.) Besides, she had but modestly suggested to Jesus her wish, saying, "They have no wine"; she had only pointed out to Him the needy state of things. And yet Jesus disregards her wish, although the cries for help on the part of the Syro-Phœnician woman for her daughter in no wise molested Him. He expressly points Mary to her sphere as a woman. When in a similar manner the twelve, at the time when the five thousand were gathered around Him, drew His attention to the lack of bread, He by no means rebuked them as interfering (Matth. 14, 15. 16). A woman's attempt to advise in matters which lie beyond her sphere of home and her special calling, and that in matters which belonged solely

---

the Gospel. And yet the Lord's strict avoidance of the employment of women to preach the Gospel, even among the women of Israel, remains a significant indication that we should in every respect carefully keep the participation of women in the preaching of the Gospel within the bounds designated by the Master and His apostles. If these bounds are not observed the blessing which lies in the participation of women in such work can very easily be completely destroyed.

to Him as the bearer of God's kingdom—is what He rejects, with which He wishes to be unmolested. According to His judgment such an attempt on the part of the woman means trespassing the bounds of the sphere, wherein she alone is to act. The correctness of this interpretation will be all the clearer, if it is compared with the services of Mary of Bethany, who sinned so greatly, where Jesus permits these even when they proceeded from her own initiatives and shamed and corrected others (Mark 14, 1 ff.; Luke 7, 36 ff). —How much the Lord wishes to see every public act of women as such avoided, is evident also from His third saying on the cross (John 19, 26), and the implied suggestion is all the more worthy of consideration, because it is an important as well as an affectionate proof that the Son of man perfectly fulfilled, even unto the end, His filial duty to His mother. He says, "Woman, behold thy son!" Among His disciples He appoints her to a position befitting her, being a woman. He enjoins her to be satisfied with the care for one. How much His care for Mary showed itself in this selection, is of no import in the present question. But, as far as her womanship is concerned, His mother shall not claim special consideration in His congregation, neither shall such be given her. By caring for her in a private way Jesus withdrew her from publicity and counteracted the tendency of her becoming or being made prominent among His disciples. In this point the Romish church has not recognized the Lord's intention. This thoroughly accounts for the fact that just those countries in which the Roman Catholic population predominates, like Italy and Switzerland, have gone so far with the public service of women, that even in schools for the higher education of adult young men there are female teachers of youthful age, which fact, even if considered merely from a practical, technical point of view, looks very questionable.

III.

Our Lord's own conduct indicates the correct position of women in the new covenant, and even if the treatment of His mother, as now discussed, should seem not to sufficiently prove this, clearness can certainly be obtained by examining the example and instructions of the apostles.

As to the example of the apostles, only two passages in the book of Acts give us any light, and these only indirectly. In the account of the disciples' fellowship in prayer after Christ's ascension, the participation of the Lord's mother and brothers is mentioned (Acts 1, 5. 14); but afterward, before Pentecost, when they and others were assembled and Peter called upon the assembly to supplement the number of the apostles, he addressed only the men and says, "Men and brethren," (Acts 1, 16.)—although Mary and other women certainly were present. Even when those were designated, who had companied with them all the time "that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them, beginning from the baptism of John," the apostles did not include Mary and the other women. Evidently the right of women to advise and act in social matters and affairs pertaining to the church as a whole, was, from the very beginning, not recognized by the apostles, while they did not hesitate to make these women the associates and participants in prayer and spiritual things. Nor was this changed as time went on, as a certain incident will show. Priscilla, even above Aquila, is called the principal instrument of God in bringing about the full conversion of Alexandrine Appollos (Acts 18, 26); and Christians in the principal city of Achaia certainly knew and honored her as one of the oldest members of the Corinthian church (Acts 18, 2 ff). Nevertheless verse 27 expressly speaks only of the *brethren* at Ephesus giving writings of recommendation to Apollos going to Corinth. Here again we see that according to the rule which the apostles maintained, in social mat-

ters and actions taken with reference thereto, women were compelled to take a back seat for the men, notwithstanding all individual excellencies.

The conclusion drawn from these facts are fully confirmed by the express instructions of the apostles. As far as the testimony of the first apostles is concerned, only one expression of Peter touches on the relation of woman to public life, and this only indirectly. This apostle in his first Epistle (3, 1. 2.) directs married women to be in subjection to their husbands; that, "if any obey not the word they also may *without the word* be won by the conversation of the wives, while they behold their chaste conversation coupled with fear." Here Peter commands Christian women to be diligent even in conjugal and domestic life to influence the men without exhortation and teaching, only by Christian conversation without the word. According to the apostle's word their Christian knowledge and discernment by no means empowered them to act the part of a preceptress; they are to bring men to see into their blindness and wrong only by their pure Christian conduct. This is in full accord with what he says further on, that women are to consider a meek and quiet spirit as the main ornament for themselves. Now, if Peter forbids Christian women to act in the capacity of teachers of the Word in their own homes, he certainly could not be inclined to permit them to take an active, advisory part in the congregational deliberations, much less could he permit them to teach in the church.

In both of these aspects the apostle to the Gentiles is agreed with the chief apostle to the Jews. As regards the former of these aspects, the agreement of Paul with Peter is sufficiently evident. From the history of the fall, related in the law, he concludes (1 Cor. 14, 34.) that women are not commanded to speak, but to be obedient. Still more clearly does Paul advocate the same thing as Peter, when in the first Epistle to Timothy he epitomizes everything which is regarded as a binding order in the Christian churches of Asia. He goes further than Peter; he not only declares that the best ornament for the women are good works, i. e., a

godly, Christian walk of life (1 Tim. 2, 10.), but adds, "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" (v. 11. 12). Here the apostle demands that Christian women shall in no wise act as teachers over against the men. At the same time he expresses the apostolic prohibition in such a manner that he most closely connects with it the conclusion drawn from Peter's admonition, that according to apostolic views every co-operation and public appearance in the deliberations of the church is unbecoming to the women—in saying, "I suffer not a woman to teach." According to Paul, therefore, it is un-Christian conduct for women to offer advice, make suggestions and teach in the meetings of the Christian congregation. In matters of a general, congregational, social nature she is to be obedient in silence to the decisions of the men and to remain silent, even if such decisions do not please and seem right to her. How absolutely this rule was enforced in all the congregation by the apostle, can be seen from the passage in the first epistle to the Corinthians, which has been but briefly touched upon in the above. For, in the first place, he shows expressly in ch. 14, 34. that as in all congregations, so also in Corinth, the women are to remain silent in the congregation, in accordance with the divine command given already to the first man. Furthermore, he points the Corinthians, who were inclined to a change in this respect, to the fact that they were only a part of Christendom and, therefore, not justifiable in trusting their judgment more than that of the primitive apostolic church (v. 36). Finally, Paul in this command, as also in the whole treatment of the matter, maintains his apostolic and prophetic enlightenment and is so certain of this divine origin of his directions, that every true prophet and spiritually minded man had to acknowledge the right and divine authority of his commandments, and if any one disregarded them, he would have to do so on his own responsibility (v. 37. 38). Besides there are several more material phases in this apostolic dissertation, which are of great importance.

Evidently the subject (1 Cor. 12-14) is the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit and their right use in the congregation, and the apostle, beginning at ch. 14, 26, points out, how such as possessed the prophetic gift should conduct themselves in the meetings of the congregations. In the first place, he gives to men thus gifted the necessary directions (vv. 28-33), drawing attention to the fact that the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. Then he speaks of the women (v. 34). Even if his direction seems general, the connection shows that Paul exhorts the men with special reference to women gifted prophetically: "Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything (inform themselves on anything) let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church" (vv. 34. 35). Of course, Paul is free from wanting to quench the spirit (1 Thess. 5, 19). In forbidding the prophetically gifted woman to teach in the church he only directs her to communicate the revelations of the Spirit within the bounds of her home and suffer them to become known only indirectly. With this, every exception to his prohibition is excluded. No natural talent and no special competency, however great, can serve as a ground for exceptions, when even the equipment with a charisma must be subject to the prohibition of public service. But in the words quoted above the apostle even goes so far as to forbid participation in congregational deliberations and consultation to the smallest imaginable degree. For in writing, "If they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home," he clearly forsees the case where doubts concerning that which has been proclaimed in the church, may arise in the mind of the Christian woman, and forbids her to bring them up personally. Thus he most clearly sets his apostolic authority against every attempt to be publicly active in congregational deliberations, even by interpellations and questions, and he does this without denying that such doubts may have reasonable grounds. It must be

borne in mind that the ground of his prohibition is his judgment that such public speaking of women is quite as much a violation of her womanly modesty and dignity as it is to have her hair cut (v. 35. comp. 11, 6).

It certainly cannot be maintained that the apostolic teachings concerning the public activity of women, which publicity must of necessity be connected with many of the positions conceded them at the present day, lacks clearness and precision. But the widespread tendency of our times is to set aside the authority of the apostles, when their teachings do not suit in certain particulars; hence it is that we hear people speak of an antiquated standpoint and of the impossibility of the Apostles setting up norms and criterions for conditions entirely different from those of their own times. Hence it would be advisable to investigate the deeper ground upon which the Lord and His apostles deny to woman equality in the earthly calling and social position, including the public activity in spreading the Gospel, although in the heavenly calling they put her on an equal footing with man.

It should be borne in mind that the New Testament utterances on the subject do not in the least indicate that the apostles underrate the natural talents of women. They regard them capable of becoming participants in the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and there is, therefore, no reason for imputing to them the belief in a smaller capacity of women to judge things, and that for such imputed reason they in all congregations forbid the woman to officiate publicly. Whoever maintains and testifies to the equal calling of woman to full membership in God's kingdom and does it so earnestly and thoroughly, furnishes the most complete evidence for the equality of woman in every respect. But the equality in the highest respect, which is based on that, has its ground right in the essentially supernatural character of God's kingdom. In Christ no natural differences are recognized, and hence also the difference of sex falls away. In the consummation there will be, according to Christ's own words (Matth. 22, 22-30), no difference of sex,

but only transfigured believers. There only the matured spiritual individuality, is recognized, while everything belonging to the incomplete present world, yet in a process of completion, will vanish. To the corruptible, which must put on incorruption (1 Cor. 15, 53), belongs also the difference of sex, which is necessary only for the growth and change of this world. But right here is at the same time revealed the profoundest ground for the woman's different position in the incorruptible kingdom of God and in the earthly, corruptible world. It rests above all things on the order of creation and the differentiation of all creatures to the minutest details, which is absolutely necessary for all things earthly and changeable. And it is by no means only a view of things which has been latterly imputed to the apostles. For Paul himself refers to the divine order in creation as the source of his assertion that woman is not enjoined to speak but to be obedient. For, when in 1 Cor. 13, 34. he adds, "as also saith the law," he does not mean a Mosaic precept, but refers to Gen. 3, 16. where the law teaches the position of both sexes as the order designed by the Creator for the present world of sin, and avers the lasting validity of the primeval order in the old covenant. Paul emphasizes that Moses maintains this original order of God (as *also* saith the law) and that he did not relax anything on account of the Israelites' hardness of hearts, as, for instance, with regard to the marriage law (Matth. 19, 8). But it is not only the divinely prescribed mutual relation of the sexes upon which Paul bases his command. He not only maintains that this relation is not nullified in the New Testament dispensation, the church still belonging to the creation and of necessity externally bearing creation's marks—but, expressly referring to creation in the first epistle to Timothy, he yet adds a suggestion that the paradisiacal forwardness of woman substantiates his prohibition. Declaring, "I suffer not a woman to teach," he adds, "for Adam was first made, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression," (1 Tim. 2, 13. 14). Hence, the fact that the woman is more

easily deceived, when something is "pleasant to the eyes", when anything seems pleasant and advantageous, as shown by the fall, and the fact that the woman introduced transgression by persuading man to obey her (Gen. 3, 17.)—these are the apostle's reasons for commanding the woman to be silent in the congregation and not to appear in a public capacity. By every participation in congregational deliberations and especially in the public transactions, passionateness is easily aroused and hence, being subjectively easily excited, the danger to her is the greater, so that the tongue, as James warns all who wish to "be masters", proves to be "a world of iniquity" and "defileth the whole body" of woman. In this, as seen from the fall, would be the danger of the whole congregation drifting into all manner of transgression and error, as also in this that the calmness and solidity of the deliberations would suffer.

IV.

Hence the apostolic direction is not based on an antiquated prejudice, but on a profound psychological and everywhere substantiated insight into the peculiar nature of the woman, as of the sex which is weaker (1 Pet. 3, 7), because more capable of being deceived. Aside from the fact that every departure from the apostolic order and teaching is a temptation of obedience against the Word of Truth, it must in many respects become a snare to the church of Christ and an occasion of new moral dangers and defects. Already for this reason, the treatment of the social position of women, as far as a change is concerned, demands of the men as the stronger, especially as in this they have the right to decide—to be mindful of the words of Paul concerning the relation of the strong to the weak: "But judge this rather (let your decision be thus) that no man put a stumbling block, or an occasion to fall, in his brother's way" (Rom. 14, 13). The decisive mark for all means and methods which may be pursued in raising the woman's position, as changed conditions of the times demand—according to apostolic teachings must be this, that public or official

activity in the church is in no wise to be granted her. She must be kept away from everything which might give rise to her speaking in public and especially in the presence of men.

The New Testament gives more food for reflection on the woman's social position in Christendom than is generally supposed. Paul's well-known prohibition is not so isolated that it could easily be set aside as an emanation of his earlier position. He is not only in the fullest accord with the other apostles, but he also in this qpestion shows that he is of the same mind as was also Christ Jesus. Thus he expresses himself even on this point, seemingly so foreign to his Gospel, fully conscious of his apostolic enlightenment and mainaining his authority as an ordained witness of Christ. Moreover, his teachings are most intimately connected with the most profound insight into the specific nature of woman, and with the order of creation, not set aside by the Gospel, the purpose of which is rather to complement the order of creation than to set it aside.

The exclusion of women from public activity and public offices, ever customary in the Christian church, and the implied rules for the correct limits of her social position, only those will consider as no longer obligatory, who in general will permit the maintenance of New Testament authority only when it suits their purposes. Any one who, after the manner of the Salvation Army, thinks himself directly taught by the Spirit in a fuller measure than the apostles were, although in so doing he grossly contradicts 1 Cor. 14, 37 ff.—or who thinks the apostles' teachings inferior to those of Jesus Christ Himself and thus inadequate to His intentions—or who conceives the kingdom of God only as an ethical concept, which, accordingly, must be fully realized in this world—or who has gone so far as to distinguish between the historic Christ and the Christ for our own time in such a manner as to be compelled to tell himself, by a mere spiritual relation to the former, what He would to-day put down as following and serving Him:—such an one will, of course, regard as immaterial and indifferent what the New Testament teaches concerning the social position of woman in Christendom. Only that which seems practical to him in view of our conditions will be his guide. But such an one will then also be compelled to forego the privilege and right of being acknowledged as evangelical, since there is, indeed, no other Gospel than that proclaimed by the apostles (Gal. 1, 8).

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. XVI. APRIL, 1896. No. 2.

CUNNING DEVICES.

BY PROF. M. LOY, D.D., COLUMBUS, O.

Man is not the independent creature that many think he is and many imagine themselves to be. He has a will of his own. It pleased the Creator to endow him with this, and thus to make him a creature of moral responsibility. But the Creator governs the universe notwithstanding that; and the creature man, although he may even use his will against his Maker, must not presume that therefore he can do as he pleases, and that no power can interfere with his pleasure or call him to account. God rules. He still rules when men in their folly think that they do not need Him and declare themselves independent of Him and His Word. They thus subject themselves to the strong delusions presented by the enemy of souls. But that enemy does not reign supreme. The Lord of all sets bounds and limits to His power and work; and the devil and his angels as well as men, are under His government and finally subject to His judgment. It is therefore merely a cunning device of the devil, the pronounced and implacable enemy of human salvation, when human souls, because they have the dreadful power to oppose their Maker and compass their eternal misery, are led to conclude that they have also the right to do as they please and can maintain it against the Creator as well as against the creature. They claim to do their own thinking, but they are brought under the power of strong

delusions, in virtue of which they believe a lie. What seems to be a result of independent thought is frequently a consequence of the devil's cunning device. Well-meaning men are often caught in these devices, so that they co-operate with men who evidently do not mean well. The result is the same, if not immediately in the destruction of the agent, yet certainly in the influence for evil that is exerted, whether the evil be conscious and intentional, or whether, under the power of "strong delusion," it be a seemingly innocent error through the "cunning devices of Satan." Therefore we cannot allow the difference between good and evil motives, important as it is in forming our judgment of individuals, to play a decisive part in the questions of doctrine and life which are forever settled by the Word of God, who alone is Lord, and whose revealed will is the rule according to which the final judgment shall be pronounced. The purpose of the devil is to undermine and counteract the power of that Word, and he has cunning devices to accomplish his purposes which he calculated to mislead as well the reasonable men pursuing civil righteousness as the rascally men who care nothing for righteousness, civil or spiritual.

Let it be observed, therefore, that when, in the following lines, we point out certain cunning devices of Satan, and warn against them, we are not pronouncing any judgment on the motives which actuate those who are employed as agents in the work. That is not the essential matter in our contention. If some are deceived, the more is the pity. Our desire is to help them by exposing the deception, that they may turn from the error of their ways, whatever their motives may have been when they were entrapped. If some are in harmony with the deceiver and have entered consciously into his plans of thwarting the will of God and making His government a failure, the more sad is the situation. Our desire is to show them that he who sitteth in heavens shall laugh, and that their puny efforts to dethrone their Creator only render them ridiculous before all intelligences, divine or angelic or human.

1. One of these cunning devices is to lead man to the belief that he needs no supernatural revelation, and that

therefore every claim which it makes upon him to accept it and subject himself to its direction and control is unreasonable. Does not human reason, that noble gift of God to man as an endowment of his nature, by which he is elevated above all other earthly creatures, suffice to guide him through life and lead him to the goal which he was designated to attain? There is much to induce men to think so, and Satan makes full use of this semblance of reasonableness as a foundation for his cunning devices.

But the trouble is that man has sinned and lost his original power. In consequence of this all reasonings based on the assumption that he is still in possession of all created gifts are unreasonable. All Rationalism is on that account fundamentally and radically irrational. It has as little claim to intelligent respect when urged in Christendom as in heathendom. Pagans have urged that men need only follow reason, and all will be well. The best theories which they have been able to devise for the education of our race are based on that principle. Only give men light, they argue, and all that is needed to fulfill their mission will follow. And so plausible seems the argument that not only under our advanced civilization, but even where Christianity has been exerting its benign influence, this educational theory and practice manifests its influence. Multitudes still expect from mental illumination the wonders which it never wrought.

There are in these problems two essential elements which the argument fails to take into account.

One is that the light of nature is inadequate to supply the wants of the human mind. This is not designed to question or to disparage the allegation that this light is a revelation from God. It certainly is. He makes Himself known by His works: by those He proclaims to intelligent creatures on earth and in heaven His will and His glory. But those who are really desirous to know His will—to say nothing of promoting His glory, which is always conditioned by such knowledge—cannot disregard the twofold facts that the revelation thus given does not embrace the plan of salvation, which has become necessary in consequence of man's sorrowful folly and that, even if it were supposed

to embrace such plan, this would not be available to the creature concerned and would therefore be useless. The revelation in nature could not embrace the plan of redemption, because the sin that rendered this necessary was no part of the creative purpose. It entered as a disturbing element, which would be provided for only by a special economy of grace that required a special revelation. Therefore only where the obvious fact of sin in the world is denied, would there be any reasonable expectation that the light of nature would suffice for all human purposes. It does not suffice. It leaves the main question which burdens the soul unanswered: who shall deliver me from the body of this death that is crushing me? And, secondly, even if there were such a revelation of deliverance embraced in the works of nature, man could not read it. His eyes are blinded, his understanding is darkened, by sins. That which renders salvation necessary disqualifies the sinner for finding it. Even what is revealed in nature concerning God and His will is spelled out with difficulty by the natural man, and with many a blunder in the result. How much less could that which pertains to the soul's deliverance from the bondage and blindness in which it lies be apprehended and appropriated!

The other material element overlooked by those who claim the sufficiency of natural light, and therefore deny the need of a supernatural revelation, is that even if man had all needful light in nature to show him the way of deliverance from death, and to direct him into the paths of rectitude and holiness and blessedness, he has in his lost estate neither the will nor the power to walk in the light. He would still need the regenerating work of the Holy Ghost to qualify him for utilizing the light imparted. Notwithstanding all the assumed mental illumination, man would still, as a matter of fact, be dead in trespasses and sins; and all his alleged holiness would be only the ghastly gibberings and attitudinizings of a corpse, that would fall into dust when the galvanic currents cease. The gospel not only reveals the righteousness of God which Christ effected, but it is the power of God unto salvation to all them that believe. Nature cannot save and sanctify; it is only the grace of God in the in-

carnate Son, revealed and operative in the gospel, that can accomplish this blessed work.

It is one of the most potent and effective devices of the crafty adversary of human salvation to appeal to the self-conceit and pride of the human intellect, and to impress and urge the plausible error that a supernatural revelation of grace is not needed. The source of the delusion is an effectual barrier to the work of grace.

2. A second cunning device of Satan is to cast doubt upon the authority and integrity of the divine revelation. If he cannot lead people to deny that there is any supernatural communication of God's will to man his next step is to place a barrier in the way of identifying and recognizing that communication. His aim is to encompass everything with seemingly reasonable doubts as to whether we really have the revelation which God is alleged to have given, and thus to hinder all reverent searching of the Scriptures that bear witness of the truth through which the Holy Spirit exerts His enlightening and sanctifying power. He puts forth strenuous efforts to invalidate the testimony by discrediting the witnesses. This is not always done by an open impeachment of their competency or of their honesty. The devices to which he resorts are cunning, and often the agents whom he employs are such as pass for truth-loving and judicious men, whose apparent calmness and fairness add weight to their influence.

In the first place it is alleged that, granting that God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, and sent forth His apostles to bear their testimony to what He has spoken, the truth which they uttered could not be handed down to later generations with such certainty of correct transmission as would convince careful and considerate minds. For does not experience show that any message which is conveyed by tradition through scores of persons and parties for years and centuries is, because the infirmity of the human mind, necessarily corrupted and soon becomes untrustworthy? The argument certainly has force. It appeals to sound reason. But it is a palpable fallacy. The cunning device consists

in concealing the fact that God made provision for transmitting the truth to all generations without fail and without adulteration, and insidiously substituting the falsehood that He left its perpetuation to man with all his liability to error. The reasoning would be right if the assumption were not wrong. Even Rome, which at least in part accepts the assumption, knows no way to extricate itself from the rational inference than that of devising an infallible human guide through the labyrinth of error; and that infallibility dream is only another cunning device to support the larger scheme of setting aside the revelation which God in mercy gave to man. It is not true that God left the revelation subject to all the errors of human tradition. He had it recorded. He selected holy men who were moved by the Holy Ghost to put it in writing, and through these writings communicate it with infallible correctness and purity to us. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3, 16. 17. Leading people to think that there is no reliable depository of divine truth and thus no source whence the knowledge of it would be with certainty derived, is only a device of Satan to cast doubt upon the Scriptures and prevent souls from finding their Savior in them. They testify of Him.

In the second place it is alleged that these Scriptures are not in such a state of integrity that judicious minds can be satisfied with their form and composition, and be sure that what they set forth as the divine revelation and the very truth of God is trustworthy in any such sense that a sinful soul, knowing the condemnation under which it lies and seeking deliverance from the curse that is on it, would trust in the mercy there revealed and in the pardon there proclaimed. Critical minds want to examine the matter. And this certainly seems reasonable. The higher criticism apparently has sound logic in favor of its alleged design to investigate. Perhaps even some of those who reach results adverse to the integrity and trustworthiness of the Bible are not conscious of any purpose to undermine its authority. Ostensibly they labor in the interest of science and sound

learning. Perhaps they are conscious of no other motive. But they start wrong when they start with doubt. The result, as a rule, will be a confirmation of their doubts, the final outcome of which is denial. God's grace may avert such a calamity in some minds, but the fact that all man's nature is against the work of grace leads Christian minds to fear, and even to expect the contrary. The situation is one which reason with its science cannot properly appreciate, because it cannot properly estimate the forces at work in producing the results. Naturally man is averse to the revelation of grace as presented in the Bible. When one, instead of accepting that grace as his comfort and joy, in the consciousness of sin which makes him sure that he is otherwise lost forever, has so far resisted the power of gopel truth that he doubts whether, as it is conveyed to him in the Scriptures, it is the truth of God at all, he has virtually prejudged all claims of the Bible, and all his efforts at candor and fairness will never render him unprejudiced.

We are not unaware how objectionable our contention must appear to men whose judgments are formed only from the data which nature supplies. In questions that lie within the scope of reason nothing seems more irrational and unjustifiable than leanings to the one side or the other before the evidence has been heard and examined. Ignorance and prejudice cannot be allowed to have a voice in deciding them. All reason demands a fair examination of the facts and a verdict according to the findings. A foregone conclusion has no title to respect. But there is a factor in matters pertaining to the Bible and human salvation that does not enter into the affairs of nature, but that is essential in the sphere to which salvation pertains. Of this due account must be made, if we desire to exercise any fairness or to be truly reasonable. For let it be considered that "the natural mind is enmity against God." If there are some poor mortals who do not know this, or who doubt it or deny it when it is brought to their notice, the objective fact remains the same, in spite of their subjective state and their consequent action. There are some whom the grace of God has brought to recognize it, and they cannot otherwise than form their judgments accordingly. They would not be

reasonable if they did not take into account all that bears on the subject before them. Because the natural mind is enmity against God, only the grace of God in Christ which converts the soul can make it at all fair in judging things pertaining to human salvation. That alone can overcome the prejudices that are in the soul by nature, and can qualify it to deal justly with nature and with grace and rightly to use the facts which both present, each according to their purpose and design.

To Christian minds it is therefore a cunning device of Satan to reduce the whole question of the authenticity and integrity of the Scriptures, in which the supernatural revelation of God's plan and power for the salvation of man is revealed, to the level of natural reason, and thus to subject it to the culprit's judgment and revision. The Supreme Ruler of the universe does not do things in that way. He is merciful, but He does not invite the criminal to sit as judge in his own case, or on the authenticity or constitutionality or equity of the law according to which judgment is pronounced. "If any man will do His will," our Lord says, "he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." John 7, 17. So if any one believe in the Lord Jesus Christ unto the saving of his soul, he will know of the Bible that it is God's Book in which Christ and the salvation that is in Him is revealed. If you search the Scriptures with a view of glorifying yourself by the exhibition of your own acumen and skill, doubting whether these things be so, you will probably come to the conclusion that the Bible cannot be depended on; if you search them in the humble purpose to find salvation in Christ for your sinful and condemned soul, you will find it the most precious of books because it brings you the comfort of salvation.

We are not contending that critical investigations concerning the history of the sacred Scriptures are to be pronounced profane and unlawful. The Bible shrinks from no fair examination of its form or of its contents. What we maintain is that those who are not under the influence of grace never can be fair in the treatment of the Bible. They are by nature prejudiced against it, because the carnal

mind, which all men have by nature, is enmity against God. And that which the teaching of Scripture makes antecedently certain in this regard is corroborated by the facts. In the efforts of the so-called higher criticism to invalidate the contents of the Bible by showing the work of man in its matter and make-up, no unprejudiced mind could fail to see the unfairness with which facts are assumed and explanations hostile to the claims of the Scriptures are given of these imaginary facts. It occurs more than once in critics who are recognized as sober and moderate that their alleged facts are furnished by the imagination and their inferences from them, even supposing that they were facts, are palpable fallacies. However critics may mean it, the attempt to tear the Bible to pieces and reconstruct it, according to human notions, is a cunning device to divest it of its divine authority and power.

3. A similar result is attained when, although it is admitted that a supernatural revelation has been given to man, and also that this revelation is contained in the Scriptures which, by God's providential care, have been handed down to us in their integrity, their contents are made subject to the scrutiny of the human mind, and this is declared to be the judge of the truth of that which is revealed and accepted as such. It is a cunning device of the devil to neutralize the entire gain of the Church in its rescue of the Holy Scriptures from the assaults of its foes, by making the authority of its doctrines and precepts dependent on the sanction of man's reason, and ultimately on man's feeling and will, by which the reason is always largely swayed, and by which in spiritual things it is dominated. The principle is thus subversive of the whole plan and purpose of a supernatural revelation, and yet, by a strong delusion, is made to appear reasonable. The cunning device therefore often succeeds where other expedients of Satan, the liar from the beginning, have failed.

In the first place, it is alleged that the supernatural revelation, as proceeding from the same God who by His works of creation and government of all creatures has made Himself and His will manifest to men, cannot otherwise than be in harmony with such natural revelation, and cer-

tainly can in no case be in conflict with it. And certainly the contention seems eminently reasonable. In view of the situation we cannot wonder that so many are ready to concede the claims. And yet it is all a cunning device to entice poor sinners to a refuge of lies which affords no protection against the consequences of their sin and no deliverance from death.

One need not be eminently learned in the book of nature and in the book of grace to perceive where the fallacy lies. The two have not the same purpose and do not cover the same ground. Because all the acts of God are emanations of His will, they are necessarily divine revelations to the extent of their intelligibility. But whether they are intelligible at all or not, or how far they may be intelligible, depends on the condition of the creatures. Some are not able to read at all, because they have not been endowed with intelligence. Some that have been endowed with intelligence are, in consequence of debilitating influences, in no condition to exercise their original powers. They cannot see, because they have become blind. Even what is in the natural revelation therefore fails to become manifest to most creatures, even including the larger number of those that have intelligence.

But this is not all. The things supernaturally revealed in the Holy Scriptures are not embraced in the manifestation which God has made of Himself and His will in nature. Therefore the knowledge derived from natural sources can as little be a standard for judging the supernatural things revealed in the Bible, as it can be a sufficient substitute for such revelation and render this superfluous. A man would, by the verdict of all reason, be declared incompetent to judge questions of science that can be solved only on the basis of facts which are visible, and can therefore be known only by the sense of sight, if he, being blind, should presume to judge them by the sense of hearing or of touch; and all intelligence would regard his pretensions ridiculous, if he in his self-conceit should presume to set up his judgment against that of people who can see. No less ridiculous is the claim that what is learned from the light of nature is the necessary and sufficient guide for the interpretation of that which is

learned from the light of Scriptures. Christians who are able to think cannot but regard the demand made upon them that they, with their supernatural knowledge derived from the Word of God and their happy acceptance of the truth by the faith which the Holy Ghost has wrought in them, should after all and in spite of all that God has done for them, recognize a principle which would reduce all to mere naturalism and at one full swoop destroy the whole foundation on which their faith stands and their happiness depends. Rationalists are the most irrational of men, when they assume that they have a mortgage on all reason, and base their calculations on the presumption that all Christians are fools. The man who never left his native district may have doubts about the facts concerning nature and society reported from places lying beyond his horizon, but it is never to his credit that his view has remained so narrow, and it always renders him the laughing stock of intelligent people when he stupidly makes his village experience the standard by which natural and human possibilities are to be judged. If men know nothing of the supernatural revelation given in the Scriptures, and of the light and the life which it confers, let them not presume to judge of these things which lie beyond their horizon, as they themselves demand that the blind and the deaf should not regard themselves as authority in questions of sight and sound, and that the villager should not make his narrow experience the test of universal truth in the domain of nature.

In the second place, it is alleged that when God gives a revelation to man for his guidance and government, it must in the nature of things be subject to the judgment of the minds that are addressed and that are to receive its benefits. All reason, it is claimed, teaches us that all alleged truth which presents itself to the human mind must be examined and tested and approved before it is accepted. Man's liability to error makes this necessary, and man's knowledge of such liability makes this obligatory. This is plausible; and on this plausibility the cunning device is built to render the whole supernatural revelation nugatory by antecedently ruling out everything that does not come within the scope of natural knowledge and of natural experience.

Hence natural tests are applied, and the result of the investigation will just as certainly be adverse to the statements of the Bible as the investigations of the philosopher whose whole life was spent in a hot climate resulted in a decision adverse to the claim that water could harden into ice over which men could walk as on dry land.

It is not reasonable that the truth which has been learned in one sphere should be a criterion by which our judgments are to be formed in another. The cunning device that would on that ground discard supernatural revelation is a mere confusion and delusion. God reveals in the Scriptures what nature does not reveal. The revelation is given to man, and unquestionably it is designed to be for his benefit. And certainly he cannot enjoy the benefit when he refuses to receive it. The Bible does not illumine the path of a soul that prefers the darkness and closes its eyes to the light. Naturally, moreover, men do prefer the darkness, though they never grow weary of their boast respecting the preciousness of the light of nature. They are by nature indisposed to accept any other light. Whatever claims may be made in regard to any other they are prone to reject. On their ground there is no other. If then any other is alleged to exist in the Bible, they naturally apply the tests which natural knowledge presents, and the plainest words communicating knowledge in a higher sphere are perverted so as to be accomodated in meaning to the knowledge which nature has taught them, or it is pronounced false. It is then not only a matter of course that there can be no miracles and no prophecies, because nature teaches nothing of the kind, but that there can be no incarnation of the Son of God, and no vicarious atonement, and no salvation by faith in His blood shed for the sins of the world, and no remission of sins through baptism, and no communication of the Lord's body and blood in the Holy Supper, and no resurrection of the dead, and no everlasting life by faith in Christ Jesus as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world and saves us from eternal death. What can nature tell us about all these things pertaining to the salvation of our souls that are burdened and lost by sin? The grace of God alone, which is brought to us only by the special revelation that is above

nature, can enable us to enjoy and to appreciate the supernatural light thus given. Those who reject this light and close their eyes to the knowledge which it conveys and the power which it exerts, may have a claim to our pity, but with no reasonableness, as against those who have a wider knowledge, can they claim to be competent interpreters of the Word. They are merely dupes of Satan's cunning devices.

4. There is another point which, we cannot but think, demands a place in this category. It may seem to some an ungracious act to maintain it in such a list and in such environment. But as we are seeking the profit of our readers, not primarily their favor, we are constrained to point out the cunning device of representing the meaning of God's Word as obscure and doubtful, and thus of accomplishing the same end where other devices fail. Manifestly the delusion that there is no need for a supernatural revelation and none can reasonably be accepted; that, if there is such a revelation, the document containing it is not in a reliable shape and cannot be depended on as authoritative; that, if there is a trustworthy presentation of heavenly truth in the Bible, it must be tested and sifted by the reason to which it is addressed and judged by its canons of criticism; and that, even if those canons are found irrelevant in the case of a revelation that lies entirely beyond the sphere within which reason, with its natural power and knowledge, is competent to judge, it must, on the very ground of such incompetency, leave the entire contents of such revelation dark and doubtful,— is all a delusion of the same sort, and shows the same purpose to do away with the authority of the Bible.

For Christians the groundless opinion that the revelation given in the Bible is so lacking in clearness that no certainty in regard to what it teaches and is designed to reveal is attainable, is the most dangerous of all. Let the reader observe that we do not pronounce it the strongest and most effective delusion for the world in general. People who do not admit that there is a revelation at all other than that which is given in nature, if they admit that in the proper sense there is any contained in that, will never much trouble themselves about the meaning of the Bible, which to them

is all a fraud, whatever sense its words may carry. They are a great multitude, and their influence is great on the earth. But Christians are generally beyond the reach of their folly and their sophistry. When the Bible is once believed, their speculations and ratiocinations have little effect. The same must be said of the efforts made by the schools of higher criticism to undermine the authority of the divine records as, under the directing providence of God, they have been transmitted to us. We have no reason to think that the number of those who were truly believers and who are misled by the device is very large. So far as we have been able to judge the recruits to the critical army are mostly from the multitude or unbelievers. Unquestionably the rationalistic party is very large. The world in general accepts the rationalistic principles, and so far as the world in its natural condition has been induced to take any interest in the Bible, its opinions are uniformly rationalistic. And yet we doubt whether the delusion has ever exercised upon Christian minds the debilitating effect of the principle cunningly devised in the interest of unionism, that the revelation given in God's Word is not clear and definite enough to be an infallible guide in doctrine and life, and therefore no agreement in the doctrine of the gospel can reasonably be required as a condition of church unity and church union. We cannot but think that this is the most cunning and most effective of all devices to entrap Christians, by inducing them to believe that the whole ground of Christianity on which they stand is sandy and insecure.

Our fathers knew whereof they affirmed in the Augsburg Confession, Art. 7, that "the church is the congregation of saints in which the gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments are rigthly administered," and that "unto the true unity of the church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments." They believed that the Word of God is designed for the salvation of sinners, and that all who should continue in the Lord's Word would know the truth and the truth would make them free. They therefore rightly regarded the reception and confession of that truth as the essential condition of church fellowship. What else could

be offered as a mark of distinction between the disciples of Christ and those who learn wisdom in other schools? The claim is so reasonable to every Christian mind, however unreasonable it may seem to those who recognize no premises but those which are derived from the light of nature, that it would seem surprising to find any disciples of Christ disputing it.

But Satan is an artful foe, and he has a cunning device to meet also this emergency. It would certainly be reasonable to accept the Master's Word and walk by that rule, if we could only ascertain what that word means. So much the enemy concedes, and expects to make the concession a bait to catch Christians. He makes the concession for the sake of the conditional clause. If we could only ascertain the truth. The acceptance of that qualification is the ruin of thousands of precious souls. Is there really a Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world? Some say yes, the Son of God was made flesh and redeemed them that were under the law; some say no, the so-called Son of God was only a man sanctified by the Spirit who is said to take away our sin by showing us the way to overcome it. Is there really a righteousness of God that can avail for us on the judgment day, in virtue of which we can then enter into the kingdom of glory, rejoicing in the hope of this all the days of our tribulation on earth? Some say yes, the blessed Savior fulfilled all righteousness in our stead and by faith all that righteousness is ours; some say no, the only righteousness that can possibly avail for the individual before God is his own righteousness, the only work of the Savior being that of showing us by His example how to obtain it by the proper exercise of our own powers. Is there really any divine and absolutely reliable communication of righteousness acquired for our unrighteous race and of power to appropriate such a righteousness? Some say yes, the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to all them that believe, for therein is the righteousness of God revealed; some say no, if there is such a vicarious righteousness which God accepts on the day of reckoning it avails only for those whom He has selected from the multitude of condemned

sinners or for those who by their labors and sufferings have shown themselves worthy of such distinction and favor. And so it goes on through the list of doctrines in which God by special revelation through the Scriptures has set forth the truth in Jesus for the salvation of the human race that has sinned. What shall those who have fled for refuge to the hope set before them in Christ do now? The answer ought to be easy enough for a Christian who believes the truth and has found peace in believing. Let the Word of God stand and follow that, and leave all the rest to God. He will maintain His own cause and give the victory to them that put their trust in Him. The way of fidelity and righteousness is perfectly clear.

But now comes the cunning device of casting doubt on the perspicuity of Scripture to throw all into confusion. The specious reasoning by which multitudes are deceived runs in this wise: Be reasonable. Do you not see that the party which denies the divinity of Christ, or the fact of the atonement, or the sufficiency of the satisfaction alleged to be rendered, or the universality of its intent and application, or the efficiency of the means by which the application is designed to be made,—do you not see that this party, though it embraces a multitudinous variety of opinions and sentiments, contains many who are as learned as you and as righteous as you: how then can you with any show of reason or of modesty or of humility pronounce them all wrong, or with any show of love decline to recognize them as brethren in the church? Do you not see that such a course violates every law of Christian lowliness and love? Can you not perceive that where there is such a variety of opinions the only reasonable course is to acknowledge that there is nothing certain in the alleged revelation given in the Holy Scriptures, and that therefore Arians and Pelagians, Roman and Greek Catholics, Reformed and Lutheran, must be equally recognized? The argument is certainly plausible. But for all that it is a cunning device to do away with the authority of Holy Scripture and leave all to the government of the prince of this world.

Those who are sincerely desirous to build up the king-

dom of God and to secure the salvation of souls that are dead in sin, must not shrink from the sacrifice to be made in opposing these cunning devices of the devil.

THE PAROCHIAL SCHOOL PROBLEM.

BY PROF. THEO. MEES, WOODVILLE, O.

I.

In view of the fact, that both in our own synod and in other church bodies of America such schools have been established for years and have been operated more or less successfully, it would seem almost a misnomer to speak of the parochial school as a problem, which still awaits a satisfactory solution.

Granting the proposition, that experience has proven this institution to possess all the elements of vitality, which assure a certain measure of success, and further granting, that the past history of such schools in view of their influence upon congregational life and growth has removed all doubts as to their usefulness and even relative necessity; yet a close and impartial study of the whole question in its practical application justifies, in my estimation, the seemingly discouraging term of the caption.

It is not my purpose to set forth in this brief article the obvious duty of the Church to care for its youth according to divine command, which removes from the question all sophisms of expediency, considerations of profit and loss, or liberty of choice. I assume this duty to be recognized, in the abstract at least, by all Christian congregations; for were this not the case, it would simply be evidence of a degree of spiritual laxity, which is incompatible with the living faith, that should characterize at least a well indoctrinated *Lutheran* congregation. The argument then becomes restricted to differences of opinion as to the sufficient or best means through which the desired and necessary end may be

accomplished. Nor do I believe that even in this question, considered merely theoretically, there will be found widely divergent views; for the advantage of daily instruction in religious matter, spiritual discipline, and class communion between the school and church over the weekly half-hour or hour in the Sunday-school and the very imperfect and wholly unsystematic home training is so potent, that lengthy proofs would seem superfluous.

The question, then, is eminently a practical one and must be approached from this its vulnerable side, and the solution of the problem will have to be found on this basis. If it can be shown, that our parochial schools suffer from a lack of understanding their true purpose, from a false or imperfect conception of their true merits, and from unjust notions of their efficiency or inefficiency,—the day may not be distant, when our synod will point with pride to a parochial school in every established congregation.

It has been customary to construct arguments for the necessity of parish schools, largely on a language basis. The desire of German congregations to foster and propagate from one generation to the other their mother tongue as the most adequate for the expression of their religious sentiments can readily be understood. Admidst the engrossing business of every day life, which overwhelmingly demands the vehicle of the English language, the German remains, often unconsciously, the language of the heart. And, paradoxical as it may appear, those who most readily relegate the use of their mother tongue to the garret, in their home life, who address their children and are in turn addressed by them in English, at the risk of committing linguistic murder, are foremost in the defense of "German schools," even to the exclusion of English.

I do not wish to be quoted as favoring a change of base in this respect, for I am convinced, that the advantages enjoyed by our youth to master the German through the medium of such schools, are regarded altogether too lightly by many. Putting aside the evident usefulness of the command of the two languages most widely employed in our country, in all business transactions, and the mental training derived from the study of two cognate tongues, it re-

mains a fact, that the origin, history, and development of our Lutheran Church are so intimately connected with the German language, the wealth of its literature is so overwhelmingly bound up in German, its terminology finds such adequate forms in the mother tongue of its great exponents, that the assertion does not seem to be so far fetched, which claims for a thorough conception of the spiritual depth of Lutheran theology familiarity with the German language.

Notwithstanding all the above conceptions, however, the language question should occupy only a subordinate place in the argument for the necessity of parochial schools, as, with due regard to parental duty towards our children, its adjustment will present no practical difficulties, if approached in a spirit of fairness and with a modicum of common sense.

Where then must we look for the difficulty? Placed in a position to observe disinterestedly the efforts of some pastors to establish such schools, as also to note the obstacles encountered by them; furthermore beholding the far more general disinclination of others even to approach the matter by summing up the objections in advance and categorically affirming the utter impossibility of successfully urging the case before their people, I have come to the conclusion, that the two great stumbling blocks in the way of success are *financial considerations* and the *public schools,* though in my conviction the latter in most cases is made the scape goat for the former.

It may serve to clear the atmosphere a little by examining somewhat the objections and claims of such as hold the superiority of the public schools over parochial schools, and put the two in competition.

As regards the better class of the graded schools of cities with their thoroughly systematic organization, it must be conceded, that in *one sense* our mixed schools of one or two grades cannot compete successfully in popular favor, and much higher motives must determine their utility. Unquestionably the superior beauty and fitness of our modern school buildings with their lavish appurtenances both for the comfort of the pupils and for purposes of instruction appeal powerfully to the imagination and taste of parents

and children. The contrast between such surroundings and the often unnecessarily modest equipments and but too often truly uncomfortable and unhealthful apartments of church schools is so striking, that mere sentiment cannot be relied upon to ignore it.

Again the teacher in graded city schools is but a wheel in a carefully constructed machine, which derives its motive power from a central source and turns in obedience to this force, reducing the individuality to a minimum, or by constant supervision casting it into a fixed mold. Each grade's work is carefully mapped out by the authorities; special work is supervised by special instructors, who direct both teachers and pupils; the principal of a school is a source of appeal for every teacher in the building and lends his authority in matters of instruction and discipline to his subordinates; these in turn are responsible to and dependant upon the superintendent of all schools, whose influence is exerted through personal inspection and joint meetings for discussion and instruction. Behind all stands the Board of Education with its vast facilities and power. Does it not stand to reason, then, that in such a well ordered system even unschooled and very moderate talent may achieve a certain degree of success within its limited sphere? All this, with an enforced regularity of attendance, during the school year and an uninterrupted continuance at school for from six to eight years ensures most of the boasted results of the public schools, which are made arguments against certain shortcomings of the parochial school.

The case is quite different, when we compare the work of parochial schools with the average district school. Placed on a more equal footing, almost without exception the faithful labor of our trained teachers shows to full advantage. It were idle to parade this fact as some extraordinary achievenment. Careful padagogical training, a due influence of the individuality of the teacher, faithful performance of a duty thoroughly understood, and a spirit of self-sacrifice in serving a Master not of worldly authority, combine to work admirable results. On this line we indeed may enter the competitive field of education with the public schools without fear of suffering.

Yet there are other considerations of weight not to be passed by in order to set forth the whole difficulty in its remotest ramifications. A moment's reflection will show, that even with an equal number of school days in the year and years in the course, our schools lose at least *one-fourth* of the time allowed public schools for purely secular studies, by the necessary introduction of religious teaching in all its branches. In view of this curtailing of the time allowance, either the same amount of work must be done more superficially, or some things must be eliminated from the course, which not unfrequently are the very things designed to catch popular favor in the common schools. We must of necessity narrow and deepen our course on certain lines, retaining indispensable branches at the sacrifice of the more ornamental. That such proceeding need not be detrimental to the educational value of the instruction is well understood by educators of high standing, whose judgment cannot be biased by appearances; but the majority of people will refuse to accept the verdict as conclusive.

Again the immediate supervision of a parish school is as a rule delegated to the pastor, whose accomplishments may be superior, whose training, however, is not always pedagogical. Opinions as to course of study, methods of instruction and principles of discipline sometimes widely differ and may lead to friction and clashing of authority which must work mischief to the school. If the teacher by that peculiar sympathy which marks a successful pedagogue, has gained the confidence and love of pupils and parents, it is but a step to division in a congregation when called upon to exercise the final jurisdiction on disputed points, and to what extremes human frailty and passion may lead, experience has amply demonstrated. Whilst any hostility which may have been incurred by the teacher in the conscientious discharge of his duties is made an instrument for undermining his influence and decreeing his unfitness, and as the congregation is both accuser and judge, no appeal becomes possible.

A further source of weakness may be found in the school boards, composed of members of the congregation and elected from its membership by the usual method. To

this board is entrusted the management of the school in detail.

If the boards of the public schools, composed, as a rule, in their majority at least, of representative citizens and cultured men, often decree educational monstrosities, is it surprising, that a body of men, though well meaning and honest, yet entirely out of touch with educational matters and lacking the capacity intelligently to weigh important questions pertaining to the improvement of the school, to recognize its requirements and measure its work, will make grave mistakes, and in the exercise of its authority handicap the labor of the best teacher? Let him depart ever so little from the ruts of an Ichabod Crane of Sleepy Hollow fame and introduce methods and subjects in keeping with the requirements of the age and having the sanction of tried leaders of thought, and he will have to combat the argument, that what was good enough fifty years ago, will be sufficient to-day. A requisition for a small appropriation to provide necessary apparatus for efficient work is met by the clinching argument, that the parents never saw such things while at school and the teacher ought to know enough to teach without such newfangled traps. If he needs them, he can provide them out of his munificent salary of $325 or $350. In such cases the trouble is more easily pointed out than the remedy suggested.

Finally a trinity of disadvantages confronts us; the manifest duties of the parochial teacher apart from his school-work, his isolation, and the meagre salary.

The young and inexperienced teacher is taught in the seminary and very soon discovers for himself that, in order to accomplish any satisfactory results whatever, he must devote all the time at his command to the preparation for his class work, of which catechetical instruction claims no insignificant part. What with the unavoidable visits to the homes of his children, the day seems to lack the necessary hours for his very routine work. Yet in addition he is called to fill the position of organist and choir-leader, which, unless he be an accomplished musician, requires careful application and thorough study and practice to satisfy the exacting tastes of his employers. Furthermore he is expected to be

the leader and general director of the young people in their society meetings and entertainments and to take an active and prominent part in the organization and management of the Sunday-school, where such is established.

Is it a matter of great wonder, that with such division of labor his powers become impaired in the same ratio as concentration upon the requirements of his special sphere of work is denied, and that the resultant consciousness of mediocrity gives birth to dissatisfaction and discouragement which finally culminate in true inferiority?

Equally destructive of the highest pedagogical attainments and enthusiasm I rate the comparative professional isolation of most parochial teachers. Excepting a few city schools where two or more teachers are employed, the great majority of our teachers is so situated, that intercourse with fellow-workers and interchange of opinions and experience is limited to occasional and more formal meetings. Even then the benefit is rendered questionable in a degree, on the one hand, by the limited range of subjects discussed and by the manner of their presentation; on the other hand by the lack of some authoritative decision as to the practical value of pedagogical soundness of one or the other theory or view. It should be remembered, that we have no absolute rule of faith and practice in pedagogy as we have in religion. Systems have crowded systems and theories have succeeded theories, until the very School Journals and Educational Reviews and Handbooks of Pedagogy present labyrinthian intricacies, in which the guiding thread of Ariadne is not easily discovered. The technique of teaching in consequence becomes largely experimental, and vacillating from one system to another must lead to unsatisfactory results.

In many cases, however, even this advantage is denied to our teachers, and unless, impelled by exceptional energy and a strong natural inclination, such forlorn outposts will gather rust, until their very natures have been consumed to the mere external form of educators. Machine like as the work is, I do not deny some useful results even in such instances; but I seriously question, that true education of our youth will crown such efforts, without impugning the conscientious purpose of the teacher.

Last, but not least, I must designate the small salaries received by most teachers as detrimental to the best interest and development of our school-work. A moment's reflection will bear me out in the assertion. The insufficiency of salaries offered is not unfrequently appreciated. Explanatory letters setting forth the opportunities for private lessons in music or German accompany such calls, thus indirectly pointing the young teacher to a sphere of activity outside of his regular calling as a source, from which his depleted exchequer may be re-enforced. The fact, that, by so doing, the most valuable time for preparation and self-study is necessarily curtailed and the energy so needful for his schoolwork is sapped, seems to escape attention. Such work may be undertaken by an experienced teacher without serious loss to the school; but to a young man, still lingering on the threshold of pedagogical routine, stocked perhaps with theory, but still a novice in the practical art of teaching and wrestling with everyday experiences and unsolved problems and difficulties, mental dissipation of this kind must prove hurtful.

Equally discouraging is the inability to provide standard or current literature on school matters. Where city or school-libraries can be utilized in larger cities, the want of a private library is not so serious a matter, but to such as are far removed from such sources of information, the lack of periodicals and pedagogical works amounts almost to a misfortune.

No one will claim that the internal resources of a young teacher, the material stored up during a seminary course of two years, are sufficient to supply the constantly growing demands of a live school. The mind of a successful teacher must be constantly on the alert to devise and plan, to invent and apply; his judgment must be rapid and true in its decisions and must anticipate difficulties not yet materialized; his interest must be roused to a pitch sufficiently tense to cummunicate itself to his pupils with a magnetic force, as it were. All this requires a constant mental communion with the thoughts of others, whose mastery of the subject kindles a flame of enthusiasm and intellectual glow, which lies at the bottom of successful school-work.

In these remarks I have outlined the difficulties which, as a rule, beset our parochial teachers and which place them at a decided disadvantage over against the teachers of the public schools. Is it just then, I venture to ask, to compare certain results of such schools with more modest pretensions of the congregational school on the same plane?

The argument, therefore, of successful rivalry cannot be made conclusive either for establishing such schools or for meeting objections of obstructionist. The necessity of parochial schools, their inestimable value to a congregation derive their force from the one valid and incontrovertible scriptural injunction, to train our children in the admonition of the Lord.

"MY LAMBS" AND THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

BY REV. J. SHEATSLEY, DELAWARE, O.

This paper is an attempt at determining in how far the Sunday-school complies with Jesus' command, "Feed my lambs." As a sufficient justification of such an inquiry the following facts may serve: First, the very great extent to which the Sunday-school has assumed the work of feeding Jesus' lambs; secondly, the numerous expressions of dissatisfaction with the way in which this work is being done and with the results. As to the former of these facts, the church has scarcely a greater work to do than that of teaching children the way of life, and she can certainly not be at ease with the present arrangement, unless she can produce divine authority, either explicit or implicit, for assigning to so great an extent this important work to the Sunday-school. Aside from all questions of result the church must be convinced that she has in the Sunday-school essentially the divine arrangement for feeding the lambs. So long as the church is not settled in this conviction the Sunday-school at least in this aspect is open for discussion. As to the second of the above statements, that the Sunday-school is not doing satisfactorily the work it has undertaken to do, it is clear that either these charges ought to be shown to be

groundless, or, if they are just, that the work of the Sunday-school itself should be agitated and discussed with a view of introducing better methods and bringing about results more commensurate with the importance of the work.

It will be my object to show briefly what the divine arrangement for feeding the "lambs" is, and then to see in how far this arrangement is essentially found in the Sunday-school. I say *essentially* present, for the essentials of an arrangement may be present, although the form of the original may have been greatly changed.

In the first place the question may be raised, Has the church a duty toward her children more or less distinct from that toward her more mature members? Is the command to teach all nations generic under which teaching children is a species, if not as to purpose yet as to method? That these questions must in general be answered in the affirmative will scarcely be denied. What then is the force of those scriptural injunctions of this specific duty of the church? Of these injunctions the words of our Savior to Peter, "feed my lambs," may be considered typical. What is the force of these words? wherein does feeding the lambs differ from feeding the sheep? Some of the leading exegetes hold that the words, "Feed my lambs," involves no specific direction for the instruction of children as different from that of the older members of the church. Meyer says, "By all three words, (*arnia, probata,* and *probatia,* which Meyer holds to be the true reading) the *archipoimen* means His *believing ones* in general (1 Pet. 5, 4), without making a separation between beginners and those who are matured, or even between laity and clergy." Godet says, "The expression: *the lambs,* designates, according to some, a particular class of the members of the Church, the children and the beginners; but the whole flock at the point where things then were, was composed only of those who were beginning and weak." With reference to the last explanation, however, it may be said that Jesus spoke of His flock not only as it was constituted then, but as it should be throughout all time, for the commission was not given to Peter simply, but to Peter's successors. The words therefore apply to the church of to-day also, and the church now is

not made up of beginners simply, but of children and beginners and of those who are more mature. The fact furthermore that Jesus uses different names to designate the members of His flock as also different verbs (boske, poimaine) to specify the care of that flock seems to indicate at least this that the different members of the flock should be cared for according to their individual needs and capacities. Children, if for no other reason, at least on psychological grounds need different treatment than those more mature in the faith. This fact has always been conceded, irrespective of the exact force of the words, "Feed my lambs."

How shall these little ones be cared for? How shall the church supply their spiritual wants so that a healthy growth may follow? But right here another question presents itself: Has the work of feeding the little ones really been given to the church, that is, to the organized congregation? Does not this office belong primarily to the family? and is not the congregation overstepping its bounds, when it assumes the spiritual care of children? That these are questions of no little import must be evident, for, since the family is a divine institution and was established to do a special work, no other institution, whether human or divine, can legitimately interfere in that work. If the church in the organized congregation has a specific duty with respect to the spiritual instruction and training of children, it must be exercised in such a way that it will not conflict with the divine functions of the family; it must be a work beyond the real sphere of the family. I of course have in mind the normal condition of affairs, where the family is doing the work assigned it. Such a condition of the family Jesus must have had in view when He said to the church, "Feed my lambs." Where the family fails to do its own work the congregation may be obliged to do a work which normally does not belong to it. Is the work of the Sunday-school in so far as it pertains to the instruction of children such an assumed work, normally not belonging to the congregation, or is it a legitimate work beyond the sphere of the family?

For the proper understanding of the relation of parents to their children with special reference to the instruction

and training of the latter it will be necessary to go back to the institution of the family and the subsequent legislation of Moses. Christ and the apostles have very little to say on this subject, since it was not necessary. What they do say pertains chiefly to the matter of obedience to parents (Eph. 6, 1; Col. 20, 21). To this however there is one striking exception, the passage in Ephesians: "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." These words embrace the whole duty of parents to children and therefore provide for all needful instruction,but their exact explanation must be sought in the Old Testament or original regulations of the family. For the parental obligations which God at the creation laid upon the family were meant to be permanent, and therefore neither Moses imposed any new obligations, but simply announced in a more specific and legal form those already existing; nor were Christ and the apostles under necessity to reveal any new ones, they simply shed upon the existing ones the life and light of the gospel.

What then according the original institution of the family is this parental obligation? The first explicit reference to it is found in Genesis 18, when the Lord commends Abraham, "For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment." These words imply that this obligation existed before, that it was recognized by all godfearing fathers, and that Abraham was faithful in carrying it out. The words, "they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment," show furthermore that this parental instruction and training was complete and met the divine requirements as well and perhaps better than these are met at the present day by family, church, and school combined. Hence in the subsequent legislation and historical development among the Israelites nothing more was sought than that this original idea of the instruction and training of children, including the servants and in fact all members of the household, should be carried out.

The subject matter of instruction may be classed as chiefly twofold: first, the historical facts connected with the development of the nation; secondly, the moral precepts of

the law. For the first of these provisions was made already in connection with the Passover: "And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, 'What mean ye by this service?' That ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover," etc. (Ex. 12, 26. 27). Compare ch. 13, 8. 14. So also at the crossing of the Jordan a monument of stone was erected for the special purpose of keeping this great event fresh in the minds of the people throughout all their generations. Thus provision was made for the instruction of children in the history of their nation, and the object was to inculcate true fear, love, and trust in God. The Psalmist in his older days had not forgotten these instruction, for he says, "We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us, what work thou didst in their day, in the times of old" (Ps. 44, 1). Such instructions furthermore fostered true theocratic patriotism, for the children were to be taught not only that they were under individual obligations to God, but also that they were members of God's chosen people. As to the inculcation of the precept of the Mosaic law the method is sufficiently exhibited in Deut. 6: "thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." Here parental instruction of the most practical kind is demanded, and there can be no question that when this method was faithfully practiced good results must have followed. The method was not a process of formal instruction, but a system by which children received daily nourishment and which therefore provided the conditions for a healthy moral and spiritual growth. It guaranteed especially this that the natural teacher, the parent, should be the actual teacher. When the nation in subsequent times departed from walking in the statutes of the Lord, it was not because of a fault in the method, but because the method was not carried out. If at the present there would be a general return to this form of parental instruction instead of delegating such instruction almost entirely to persons and institutions outside of the family, succeeding generations would be the gainers. This would of course necessitate that the parents themselves be qualified

to do the work, but such qualification would be the logical result of the system, for the children that have been well-instructed in turn become the parents and instructors. By training the children you train the future parents.

But the question now is, Was it the original idea of the family that children should receive all their instruction through it, and was this the arrangement also under the code of Moses? or was there at least at a later date something left to be done by the church in a congregational capacity? If the latter was not the case, then it would appear that Jesus transferred at least a part of the parental obligation in the instruction of children from the family to the congregation. This conclusion seems inevitable, unless it can be shown that the words of Jesus imply that Peter was to feed the lambs through the instrumentality of the family. But this can not be done, since the apostles were set as teachers and bishops in the church and not in families nor as acting through families. That the church would exert an influence upon the family is evident, but Jesus' words mean more. Nor can it be argued that Jesus transferred the feeding of the lambs from the family to the congregation, simply because the former, although by divine arrangement under obligation to do this work; yet failed in its duty. For it cannot be shown that Jesus authorized an abnormal arrangement in His Church just because the normal arrangement on account of the sinfulness of man was not fully carried out. Jesus did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it; neither did He come to set aside the original divine arrangement in society and the church, but to reassert and vitalize them. It may therefore be taken for granted without further argument that the church in her congregational capacity had or did receive, at the time of the apostles, and has still a special duty to children and that this function in no way interferes with nor lessens the divine obligation of parents to their children within the family circle.

If it is then conceded that the congregation as well as the family has a special work to do with reference to children, it will be in order next to find out if possible what the arrangement for doing this work was in the Jewish church

as also in apostolic and post-apostolic times. Did the church do this work by assuming a direct oversight of the instruction imparted in the family, so that the work, although in a certain sense performed by the church, was yet actually done in the family, or did the church have schools, corresponding more or less with modern Sunday or Parochial schools, in which this instruction and training was imparted? The latter is generally claimed to have been the case. The sacred record, however, affords no trustworthy proof for this inference. In patriarchal times the school was embodied in the family and the father was the teacher. When this affirmed change took place and separate Bible-schools were established cannot be gathered from the Bible itself, nor can it be determined with any great degree of certainty from profane and Rabinnical writings. Some therefore doubt and not without strong grounds that such schools at all existed, even at so late a date as the time of Christ. Others however find abundant proof that such schools did exist at that time, and even prior. Deutsch, quoted by Trumbull, says, "Eighty years before Christ schools flourished throughout the length and breadth of the land;—education had been made compulsory." Edersheim says, "There can be no reasonable doubt that at that time such schools existed throughout the land." Josephus says of Joshua ben Gamla, a son of the renowned Gamaliel, that he "enacted that teachers should be appointed in every province and in every town, and [that] children of six or seven years old [should be] brought to them." That the subject of instruction in these schools was the law, it is said is evident from the history and literature of the Jews. They were therefore Bible-schools in the real sense of the word.

Very little, however, has been gained for our purpose by the above assertion; for in the first place it seems very doubtful that such schools existed at all at the time of Christ. To me it seems almost incredible that, if they really existed, there should not be at least a remote reference to them in the New Testament writings. The synagogue is referred to again and again, both in the gospels and in acts, but no reference is made to the so-called synagogue-school. On the contrary, where the training and instruction of children

are spoken of, they are referred to the parents; for example, the case of Timothy. If such schools really did exist, their ominous silence might certainly be interpreted as a non-recognition of them on the part of the inspired writers. It appears then that at the time of Christ the patriarchal method of instructing children was substantially still in vogue. If in the second place these synagogue-schools did not exist till after the time of Christ, they afford no safe clue as to the way in which the lambs are to be fed in the Christian Church. One can therefore not reason safely from these schools to the import of Jesus' words, "Feed my Lambs." It follows then that in so far as these words can be explained from historical sources, it must be done by a study of the apostolic church with reference to its arrangement for feeding the lambs. For it can hardly be supposed that the inspired apostles failed to lay the proper foundation for this work as well as for other congregational functions.

First of all it is well to state expressly that in the apostolic church parents were not in the least relieved of their original responsibility with respect to the religious education of their children. This is evident from the words of the apostle, "Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Nor was it any different in the earlier post-apostolic times. In the *Constitutions of the Apostles* we read, "Do you therefore teach your children the Word of the Lord. Bring them under with cutting stripes, and make them subject from their infancy, teaching them the Holy Scriptures, which are Christian and divine, and delivering unto them every sacred writing." But neither in the second place were the teachers in the church exempt from the pastoral care of the lambs. "The promise is unto you and to your children," said Peter in his sermon on the day of Pentecost, and it was recognized that it was the duty of the church as well as of the family to see that the children be made actual partakers of this promise. How this was done apostolic records must show, and here there is no evidence whatever that children were placed in classes under special teachers, nor that the apostles themselves instructed them separately from their parents and older persons. When the word was preached to families the natural inference

is that the entire household, parents, children, and servants, were the hearers at one and the same time and place. Compare the conversion of the jailer (Acts 16, 32-34). Teaching families was furthermore one of the regular methods of preaching the gospel. Paul in his farewell to the elders of the church at Ephesus said, I "have taught you publicly, *and from house to house*" (Acts 20, 20). The churches in houses also, as the church in the house of Priscilla and Aquila (Rom. 16, 3-4), the church in the house of Philemon (Phil. 2), are examples of household teaching, when the family with such friends and neighbors who might attend constituted the audience. Compare the service in the house of Cornelius (Acts 10, 24-27). The conclusion therefore is that in the apostolic church there was no special arrangement for the instruction of children. The term "teacher" as used for example in Eph. 4, 11 cannot be made to mean a class of persons whose sole duty nor even one of whose duties it was to teach children either individually or in groups. They were teachers in the church of a lower order than the apostles and subsequent *episkipoi* or bishops, and however they may have discharged their office aside from instructing the people in the public assembly, it cannot be shown that they taught in the sense of the modern Sunday-school teacher. Neither can it be clearly shown that it was a special duty of deacons or deaconesses to instruct children either in private or in public. The inference therefore is that the special instruction which children received was imparted by parents themselves or by such persons whom parents may have appointed.

But it may then be asked, what becomes of the injunction to Peter, "Feed my lambs"? The reply is that the apostles complied with this by going from house to house and teaching entire families, and by teaching in the synagogues and other public assemblies where children and young people were evidently also present. It appears then that those exegetes are right who hold that the words, "Feed my lambs," do not imply the necessity of a special arrangement in the church for the spiritual care and instruction of children, but only that they are to be considered

an integral part of the flock and dare not therefore by any means be overlooked or ignored.

What however was the arrangement for the instruction of children later on, say in the second and third centuries? History affords no evidence that any special arrangement for the instruction of children existed. Whatever was done in this respect must be sought in the *Catechumenate*. This was an institution which had its beginning in apostolic times, and was represented by such methods as the apostles' "teaching from house to house," especially where the first elements of the Christian religion were imparted. The *Catechumenate* toward the close of the second century developed into a distinct institution in the church, whose object however was primarily the preparation of heathen adults for baptism or reception into the communion of the "faithful." Catechetical schools were established in the more important church-centers. The one at Alexandria became especially renowned. Here Origen received his training under Clemens of Alexandria and at the age of eighteen himself became teacher in that school.

However when it was said that this arrangement was meant primarily for heathen who desired to become Christians, it is not to be thought that the children of Christians were excluded, or that they received no special preparation for reception among the "faithful." Special preparation may not always have been required, because not always necessary, the family instruction no doubt in many cases sufficing, but where it was required the Catechumenate in its various stages of development was the church arrangement for securing that preparation. For this work persons were appointed called "catechists." In the *Epistle of Clement to James* the duties of the catechist are set forth. "Let the catechist instruct, being first instructed. . . . For the teacher of the word must accomodate himself to the various judgments of the learners. The catechists must therefore be learned, and unblamable, of much experience, and approved, as you will know that Clement is, who is to be your instructor after me." That the subject matter of instruction were the teachings of Christ and the apostles goes without saying. The method of instruction was not that of

a lecture or formal discourse as the sermon, but by direct talk to the hearers, interspersed with questions and answers. This arrangement then for instructing the young and the uninitiated is the nearest approach to the modern Sunday-school so far found, but even here the exact counterpart is not the Sunday-school but the Catechetical class and the *Christenlehre.*

This catechetical course however extended at the most only over a period of three years when it ended with baptism and later with the rite of confirmation or laying on of hands, and reception into full communion with the "faithful." What was done for the lambs before they entered upon this course? No special provision was made for them by the congregation, but the demand was laid upon parents to instruct and train their children in conformity with the word. They were also regular attendants in the public assemblies, as is shown by the order in which the hearers were seated. Without describing the order of the entire congregation, it is enough to show what was demanded of the younger ones and the children. Of the former it is said in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (Bk. 2, ch. 57), "Let the young persons sit by themselves, if there be any place for them; if not, let them stand upright." Concerning children: "For the children which stand, let the fathers and mothers take them to them." These directions pertain to the first part of the worship, the *Missa Catechumenorum.* From the second part, the *Missa Fidelium,* consisting of the celebration of the holy Eucharist, all except the "faithful" were required to withdraw. To this however children, evidently the smaller ones, were an exception. In the above work (Bk. 8, chs. 11 and 12) we read, "Let the mothers receive their children." "Let the children stand at the reading desk; and let another deacon stand by them, that they may not be disorderly." These two statements need not contradict each other at all, since they may refer to children of different ages, or to customs in different churches. The point is simply to show that children were present.

It has thus been shown in very brief outline what provisions were made for feeding the "lambs" in the Apostolic and Post-apostolic churches. The question now is, How

does the modern Sunday-school compare with this original arrangement? It must be admitted that as far as elaborate arrangement is concerned the Sunday-school has the advantage. It has its regular hour of service, service for the entire school, classes, teachers, books for class use or Lesson Leaves, papers, libraries, collections, etc. As to actual results it is hard to make a just comparison, for the reason that, although we know the standing of children now, we are not sufficiently informed as to the spiritual standing of the children then. Aside from the elaborate arrangement of the Sunday-school which in the end may be more hurtful than helpful, there are other points in which the present arrangement for feeding the "lambs" is behind that of the first centuries of the church.

1. The lack of parental instruction in the family. Whether the Sunday-school is in any degree a cause of this or not is open to discussion. If it were, the same objection would of course hold with respect to parochial schools. But explain it as we may, the fact exists, and although it may be urged that parental training does not come under the injunction, "Feed my lambs," since this was meant for the church, yet it may be replied whether the church should not now lay more stress upon parental training.

2. Inability of the teaching force in the Sunday-school. The catechists in the ancient church were men capable of teaching. "The catechists must therefore be learned, and unblamable, of much experience, and approved."

3. The lack of the proper system of the doctrines to be taught. That Sunday-schools have a system is not questioned, but it is usually not the system calculated to lay a good foundation for a solid and compact superstructure of knowledge and faith. The system is usually arranged with the view of getting through the Bible much as children get through a common text-book. The true system requires a phychological basis, i. e. it must take into consideration the capacities of the hearers; it requires a soteriological basis, i. e. the saving truths must be taught in the order in which the soul needs them; it requires a historical basis, that is, that the order of revelation be ob-

served. There is proof that these facts were duly considered in the ancient *Catechumenate*.

4. Superficiality in the work of the Sunday-school. That the work of the Sunday-school is to a great extent scattering and superficial cannot be denied. This fact is due principally to the weaknesses noted under 2 and 3.

5. The insufficient time that the Sunday-school has to devote to feeding the lambs. This is perhaps the greatest weakness in the system and in this it falls far behind the demand of Jesus.

It may now be summed up thus: if the Sunday-school under points 2, 3, and 4 could be raised to a more perfect standard, it could as a *Sunday* school comply with the demand of Jesus, "Feed my lambs," as far as this could be expected from sinful mortals. But just because it is only a *Sunday* school, lacking the adequate time, it can never fully meet that demand.

In conclusion; it needs hardly to be stated that this paper is by no means meant to be an exhaustive discussion of the subject. It is really nothing more than an index to some of the leading facts and conditions that need to be considered.

WHAT SHOULD OUR YOUNG PASTORS READ AND STUDY?

BY REV. W. H. PRICE, A. M., WAYNESBURG, O.

It is not presumed that a satisfactory answer can be given to this question, that will precisely fit the case of every individual. Due allowance must be made for the different tastes of pastors. What might be pleasurable and profitable to one, is very distasteful to another. The one is theoretically, while another is practically inclined. The one always remains a student, while another enters more thoroughly into the practical questions of life. The one, so to speak, carries the gospel in his feet—he is an excellent pastor, while another is strong in the pulpit—he is a good preacher. Having, therefore, differents gifts, it is but natural

that their reading and studying would be somewhat in a different line. Which one will accomplish most for his Master, might be a question of dispute. The chief thing is, that both be found faithful. "Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering: or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth on exhortation" Rom. 12, 6. 7.

But however much pastors may differ in the line pointed out, yet there is a direction in which their reading and studying must be substantially identical if they will be true to their high commission to which their Lord has called them. To be neglectful here is to sin against their office and the souls committed to their trust. Here all pastors are placed in the same category. Hence the reading and studying to which we shall call attention in this paper, is of a character which we must regard as absolutely essential to a wise, efficient and faithful performance of a pastor's duties. Considering the great abundance of reading material which floods the market, books, magazines and papers, it is often a more difficult question to determine what one should not read, than what one should read. The conscientious pastor, must therefore, ever have before his eyes the great object of his calling, viz.: the salvation of souls, and whatever does not subserve that end, had best be left undone. When we consider the limited time often allotted to the pastor for private study, it should prompt him to exercise the greatest caution in the disposal of that time, that the best and greatest results may be obtained. And when we further consider the great disadvantage which young pastors are at on account of inexperience in pastoral work and sermon preparation, we can readily see that the question, What should our young pastors read and study? becomes one of great moment and importance to them.

It is not our purpose here to enter into a consideration of the manifold pastoral duties which often greatly exhaust his energies and the many vexations and troubles which so unfit him for private study. Every one knows how manifold and taxing these are. But we would simply utter a word

of warning lest we make these things an excuse for little study, when in fact it is simply a satisfying of an inborn laziness. It is to be feared that too many often consult their flesh and lose sight of their high and responsible calling which requires the close and constant application of their time.

It will be observed that we have limited our subject to "young pastors." It is to be presumed that older pastors have learned by their own sad experience, perhaps, the mistakes of their early ministry, although what we shall have to say, we believe, will be no less applicable to them also. What should our young pastors read and study? We shall classify our answer under four heads.

First. The Bible.

It may be regarded as superfluous, perhaps an insult, to urge young pastors to read and study the Bible. Is it not self-evident, that they will do this? Did they not read the Scriptures faithfully during their school days, especially in the Seminary? But alas! we are convinced that no greater mistake is made by our young pastors than their neglect to read the Bible. What was done by them at school in this respect was, in the majority of cases, extremely meager. To have read the Word of God through from Genesis to Revelation once, twice, or thrice, does not yet give us that familiarity with the Word which is necessary to a faithful and effectual performance of the ministerial office. We may have read a portion of Scripture a dozen times, but who does not find something new everytime he reads it again. And to be able to give the substance of a portion of Scripture is never as effectual as to be able to give that Scripture verbatim. This means then not only a cursory reading of the Word, perhaps for history's sake, but a studying of the same, and a memorizing of the most important portions of the Word. This may prove a somewhat irksome task, but nothing will yield better results. A single passage of Scripture, correctly quoted in its proper connection, will go farther to produce conviction than a whole page of finely spun logic and argument. The more extensive our knowledge is of God's Word, the more effectual and powerful will be our preaching. The most

powerful preachers in all times were men whose familiarity and extensive knowledge of the Scriptures were proverbial. No one will question the convenience and aid of a good concordance, and yet it is our conviction that they often do more harm than good. This need not be so, but it is often so. We desire a certain passage of Scripture and we go to the concordance. We note it down. Five minutes afterwards we have forgotten where it is found. There has been no effort to fix the book, the number of the chapter and passage in our minds. The labor is virtually lost. The great secret of success of every minister is to be able to turn readily to any passage or portion of Scripture. It is a proficiency which every young pastor should strive to attain. But this is possible only by reading and re-reading the Bible. Dr. Martin Luther placed such importance on the reading of the Bible, that he expressed the wish that his own works might perish, if the reading of them should prove a hindrance to the reading of God's Word.

The Word itself speaks explicitly and extensively on this matter. "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine." 1 Tim. 2, 15. "But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. 3, 18. "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." John 5, 39. "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." 2 Tim. 2, 15. Paul commended the Bereans because they "searched the Scripture daily, whether those things were so." These passages certainly make it obligatory upon the minister of the gospel to read, search and study the Scriptures. While they do not all refer directly to the office of the ministry, yet what is applicable and binding upon the individual church member, is certainly all the more so on the gospel minister who is to be a leader of God's people. To rightly divide the Word of truth is the great secret of all true preaching. But to be able to do this requires a most intimate acquaintance with the Word itself. Such acquaintance of the Word is attained only by giving attendance to reading and searching the Scriptures, and that daily, and not only as we are brought into contact

with the Word in the preparation of our sermons. We need not fear that this Word can be studied to exhaustion. It is an inexhaustible treasury of wisdom. It contains the wisdom of an infinite and allwise God. It is the source and fountain of all true learning and gives us the only rule and norm of faith. It contains the message which the gospel minister is to declare to immortal souls. But will he be a "workman that needeth not to be ashamed" if he declare that message stammeringly, falteringly and imperfectly? "Cursed be everyone that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully," that is negligently. And when we remember the great responsibility resting upon him whom God has made overseer of His flock, the great price paid by Jesus for the redemption of the world and that the eternal interest of the soul hangs on the message that is preached, is it not plain that this message should be known to us in all its details and particulars. How dreadful will be that day, if souls shall rise up against us in judgment who have been lost by our laziness, negligence and indifference!

Again, if we be thoroughly acquainted with the Word we will not find it necessary to preach human wisdom and opinions, or to resort to story telling to fill up the time. Besides the Word of God is so rich in illustrations, that no circumstance or condition can happen in life but what it can be illustrated by an example from Scripture. What is necessary is to know the Word.

The young pastor will also find in his pastoral relations with his people, that an intimate acquaintance with the Word will be of no less service to him, than it is in the public proclamation of the same. He will find that the needs and wants of his people are almost as many as these people. But the Word of God is sufficient and comprehensive enough to meet the wants of every individual soul. It is for the pastor to determine what is most needed in every individual case. He is, so to speak, to diagnose the case of every sin-sick soul and to apply the materia medica—the proper remedy for the disease. His success will be in proportion to his ability to read human character and his acquaintance with the Word and skill in applying it. Take it in the sick room or at the death-bed, for example, where a pastor is tried often more

severely than anywhere else, where the eternal interests of a soul are at stake, where a soul is to be prepared for a peaceful and happy departure from this life. If there is one place that a pastor should despair of his own skill and ability and where he should pray earnestly for the merciful guidance of the Holy Spirit, it is in the sick room and at the death-bed. How different do we find people! Some are patient, others impatient; some are penitent and almost despair on account of their sins, while others show few marks of repentance; some are concerned in their soul's welfare, while others are seemingly unconcerned; some long for the time of death, while others have only horrors of death. Now it is evident that the same Word is not applicable to every particular case and yet the pastor, if he will be equal to the emergency, must possess such an acquaintance with the Word, that he may be able, not only in a general way but in a particular way, to apply the specific remedy that is needed. A single passage of Scripture may prove a veritable balm to the sin-sick soul. How necessary that we should be able to give it. Not long since I entered the home of one of my members, I expressed my surprise to the mother at the sudden death of her son. She replied: "Yes pastor; but the chapter which you read and the prayer which you offered when you were here, were just what he needed." But how often do we not feel the weakness and imperfection of our ministrations. There is no fault or weakness in the Word but only in ourselves, being unable rightly to divide the Word of truth and to apply it properly. And when we consider the various relations of our people to one another: their relation to one another, as husbands and wives, as parents and children, as brothers and sisters; their relation to one another as members of Christ's Church and the many duties and obligations resting upon them as members of that Church, how important that we be well equipped in the Word that we may minister to their several necessities. Then there is the world without with its isms and schisms, with its scoffers and revilers, with its profaners and blasphemers who would make sad havoc with Christ's Church and His Word. Oh how necessary that we fortify ourselves with the Word,

that we may quit ourselves like men. Young pastors, read and study your Bible.

Secondly. The catechism, the confessions of our Church, sermon books, commentaries, etc.

It may perhaps be considered superfluous again to urge young pastors to study their catechism. Did they not do this at the time they were confirmed and all the way through school? But the pastor who is satisfied with his knowledge of the catechism at the time he left school, will do very lame work in the catechumen class. Only too often it is regarded by many as unnecessary, if not unbecoming, to require a college student to study the catechism. It may do very well for grammar school students. Hence it only receives secondary consideration, and perhaps not that. But the authorities know why it was placed in the curriculum of study and many young pastors will know before they are in the ministry long. Our precious little catechism was always a much despised book, especially among the sects, and it even fell into disfavor among some Lutherans, who considered it too slow a way to convert the world. But it is a good sign of the times to note that many are returning to the good old tried and Lutheran way of receiving members by instruction.

The catechism contains a plain and simple statement of the principal and essential doctrines for our salvation, with brief explanations and proof passages. It may be regarded as an index to the Bible. If we desire to know what the Word of God teaches upon any doctrine, for example baptism, we need but refer to the catechism to see the doctrine properly treated and fully substantiated with passages of Scripture. It is, therefore, a convenient medium of instruction. Nowhere is the pastor brought into closer relation with his people than in the catechumen class and nowhere is his responsibility greater. To do poor work here is to build on sand. The future prosperity and welfare of a congregation depends upon the work done in the catechetical class. Nine times out of ten the catechumens remain what they are on the day of confirmation. How necessary then that effectual work be done in preparing them for that important step. No young pastor should

think of appearing before his catechumen class without due preparation. That preparation should be as thorough as the work done on his sermon. We believe there are more good preachers, than there are good catechists.

The necessity also of thoroughly acquainting ourselves with the confessions of our church must likewise be apparent. These confessions are a plain, forcible and bold declaration of the true doctrines of God's Word over against the false tenets of the Roman Catholic Church on the one hand and of the sects on the other. They have been the strong bulwark of the Lutheran Church for over 400 years against which the missiles of the enemy have been hurled in vain. Being founded upon the infallible and unchangeable Word of God, they rest upon a sure foundation, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, for they contain that true confession of Peter, upon which rock Christ built His Church. While other churches have been revising their creeds or clamoring for a revision, the Lutheran Church has remained true to the old landmarks. Truth being unchangeable and possessing that, there could be no room for a revision. We might as well speak of revising the Word as our confessions, so perfect is their agreement and harmony. How necessary, therefore, that we possess an intimate acquaintance with this, the grandest as well as the oldest of all confessions. I well remember how Dr. Loy in one of his lectures to the theological class earnestly advised his pupils to read the Book of Concord at least once during the year. His extensive experience taught him the great value and necessity of this. It is to be feared that too few followed this excellent counsel. By all means let young pastors read and study the confessions of their church.

The first five and ten years of a pastor's life are usually regarded as the preacher making period. It is during this time that especial attention is given to the preparation of sermons and their delivery. The reading of good sermon books, especially on the pericopes, will prove a great aid. But these should be read not only with a view of gathering material for sermons, but also of learning the art of preaching and manner of presentation of a subject. If sermon books are used simply to plagiarize, the fewer we have the

better. But when used as a stimulus, inspiration and guide they serve a noble purpose. In the selection of sermon books young pastors will do well to consult their professors or experienced pastors.

Other aids might yet be cited, such as good commentaries and standard works of our most prominent theologians, which the young pastor will not fail to utilize as his time and means will allow.

Thirdly. Text books.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that at school only the foundation of knowledge was laid. If any structure is to be built upon that foundation the pastor must do it. Perhaps very few can look backward to their school days and not know and wish that a better foundation might have been laid. But it is too late to pine over the fact now. The chief thing is for young pastors not to repeat their mistake and continue in their folly, by placing their text books on the shelves as relics. It matters not how well the foundation may have been laid in school days, he who bids a final farewell to his text books when he enters upon his pastoral duties, will learn in due time that the mortar has been falling from the foundation, and that the structure, however grand it may appear to himself, is in great danger of toppling over. The chief thing is to keep the foundation intact. This can be done only by reviewing the text books and advancing ourselves in them. Perhaps not all text books will be directly serviceable to the pastor and yet there are those which, if he fail to use, will greatly cripple his efficiency. No one will question for a moment the great utility of the mental and moral sciences for every pastor, such as rhetoric, psychology, art of discourse and logic. If he will be an exact, clear, forcible and logical thinker and speaker, he must study these.

The reviewing and studying of the dead languages is no less necessary, in which the Bible was originally written. True not all have a taste for these languages, but not to study them because we have no taste or liking for them, is to commit the greatest mistake and folly of which a young pastor can be guilty. While the King James translation, or better still the Revised Version, and Luther's German

translation of the Bible may suffice for all practical purposes, yet there are circumstances arising constantly, when, to be able to go back to the original text, will prove a great satisfaction and aid to the pastor. A few examples will suffice to prove this. "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." Matth. 25, 46. When now Adventists and Universalists, who deny the doctrine of eternal punishment, put forth the claim that the word "everlasting" does not mean eternal,we need but cite them to the original where the same word *aionios,* which is translated eternal is used also for everlasting. Again take the word, μαθητεύσατε, in the commission. Upon this word immersionists base their whole opposition to infant baptism, claiming that the order of the words in the commission is against pedobaptism, that we must *first* teach and then baptize. While this word includes teaching, this does not exhaust its meaning, nor is it its true meaning. The correct meaning, as given in the Revised Version, is "make disciples of." Hence the commission reads: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations; *baptizing* them into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: *teaching* them to observe" etc. Now if any stress is to be laid upon the order of the words then "baptizing" must come before "teaching," which would favor infant baptism. "And he (Paul) arose, and was baptized." Acts 9, 18. The word used in the original for "arose" is ἀναστὰς and in the aorist tense. The force of the aorist is to give the customary way of performing an act. Now while in this posture Paul received baptism. We defy the Baptist world to baptize a man standing erect by immersion.

But in perusing these text books many young pastors will wish again for the aid of their preceptors. There may be some, placed in favorable circumstances, endowed with excellent gifts and possessing an indomitable will and perseverance, who will wind themselves through all intricacies and surmount all difficulties and obstacles, while there are many, not so highly favored, whose energies are already greatly taxed by their pastoral duties, who will become despondent and discouraged in the work of self-advancement,

while with proper guidance and aid they would make commendable progress. Let our young pastors, therefore, fall in line, even at the risk of being stigmatized as lazy and careless in your school days, and advocate a post-graduate course at Capital University and continue the agitation until it becomes a reality. According to the statistics given in the English address before the Alumni last June you will find that you will not lack company and that out of 38 pastors 32 favored the course and 24 would make use of it at once. But until this can be done let young pastors apply themselves assiduously and not forget the foundation upon which they are building.

Fourthly. Current Literature.

When we consider the great number of books, magazines and papers which are daily being published, it becomes often a difficult question to decide what we should read. That we could not read all and would not want to read all if we could, is evident. What then should our young pastors read in this line? We presume no one would take issue with us if we answer, read first the publications of your own Synod—books, magazines and papers. There are various reasons why this should be done. In the first place it is safe, healthy and wholesome literature; it is as ably written as any and as cheap as any. Again if we would be in touch and sympathy with our Synod and her enterprises, we must be acquainted with them. This is possible only by reading our publications and reading them until we become thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the work which Synod has undertaken—until we all breathe as one soul. Is this the reason perhaps why so many seem to be out of touch and tune with the work of Synod and assume the role of complainers and fault-finders instead of sympathizers and workers? To see our periodicals displaced on the pastor's table by the publications of other Synods, to say the least, shows an unsympathizing, if not a rebellious spirit. And not only a part but all of our periodicals—magazines and papers—both German and English, should be found on the pastor's table, even if one or the other language be not so well understood.

But we would not limit young pastors simply to the

reading of our own publications. What we desire to impress upon their minds is the necessity of giving these their first consideration and attention, that they may prove themselves the more efficient to labor in the sphere in which the Lord has called them. No, we would not have our young pastors to be as lamentably ignorant of what other denominations are doing, as we often find them to be about our church.

But the pastor should also do a certain amount of general reading, that he may be able to speak intelligently upon the living questions of the day. But it is here that he must use the greatest caution and his best judgment. Whenever he finds that his general reading is crowding out what is necessary to the faithful performance of his office, let him call a halt. The fewer political papers he reads perhaps the better. We doubt also the advisability, especially of young pastors, reading dailies. We believe too much precious time is often squandered in this way. We never could find time for it. Let the young pastor, therefore, in all his reading and studying ever keep in mind the great object of his calling, viz., the promotion and salvation of souls, and what does not subserve that end, directly or indirectly, leave undone.

SKETCHES FOR FUNERAL SERMONS.

BY REV. H. J. SCHUH, A. M., ALLEGHENY, PA.

TEXT: Gen. 48, 21. "And Israel said unto Joseph: Behold I die; but God shall be with you and bring you again unto the land of your fathers."

The farewell Word of the Patriarch Jacob as the dying Declaration of a Christian Father.

I. "Behold I die."

a. How these words would be spoken by a man of the world.

1. With fear and trembling.
2. With dumb despair.

b. How they are spoken by a Christian.
1. As one tired of the world.
2. As one waiting to enter upon his eternal inheritance.

II. "But God shall be with you."
a. How much the children of Jacob were in need of the divine presence.
1. They were in a strange land.
2. Severe trials were in store for them.
b. How these words must have comforted them.
1. They knew the God of Israel.
2. What a comfort to know that He would be with them.

III. "And will bring you again unto the land of your fathers."
a. A word of warning.
1. At the time these words were spoken they were still a prosperous people in Egypt.
2. They should not forget that Egypt was not to be their abiding home.
b. A word of comfort.
1. Days of adversity would come.
2. Then they should think of the deliverance God had promised.

TEXT: Prov. 10, 7. "The memory of the just is blessed."

How may the Memory of your departed Mother be a source of Blessing?

I. If you with gratitude toward God remember what she was to you.
a. What she was to you.
1. In bodily and temporal things.
2. In spiritual and heavingly things.
b. Whom you ought to thank for these benefits.
1. Your mother.
2. Your God.

II. If you by the Grace of God endeavor to follow her example.

a. In what respect she was a pattern.
1. Her untiring labor and care.
2. Her Christian walk.
3. Her trust in God.
4. Her patience and cheerfulness under affliction.

b. Follow her example.
1. This was her dying request.
2. What obstacles there are in the way.
3. How these may be removed.

TEXT: Ps. 103, 1-4. "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me, bless His holy name. Bless the Lord, O my soul and forget not all His benefits: Who forgiveth all thine iniquities and healeth all thy diseases; Who redeemeth thy life from destruction; who crowneth thee with loving kindness and tender mercies."

A Song of Praise with which a Christian passes from Time to Eternity.

I. For all the benefits which the Lord has bestowed on him in this world.

a. In temporal things.
b. In spiritual things.

II. For all the benefits which the Lord has in store for him in the world to come.

a. Deliverance from all evil.
b. The crown of eternal life.
c. The reward of faithful service.
d. The joyful resurrection at the last day.

TEXT: Ps. 27, 10. "When my father and my mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up."

With what disposition do Christians Children view the Death of their Parents?

I. With profound sorrow.

a. What you have lost in your parents.
b. It is but natural that you should mourn your loss.

II. With heartfelt gratitude.

a. Toward your departed parents.

b. Toward God in whose hands they were but instruments of blessing.

III. With true penitence.

a. Think of all your sins against the fourth commandment.

b. Confess the same before God with contrite hearts.

IV. With firm faith.

a. Trust in God's mercy for the sins of the past.

b. Trust in His providence for the trials of the future.

TEXT: Prov. 14, 32. "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death."

"The Righteous hath Hope in his Death."

I. What a blessed truth this is.

a. The hope of the natural man is vain.

1. How often his hopes are disappointed even in this life.
2. Death ends all his hopes.

b. But the righteous has hope in death.

1. To him death is a deliverer.
2. To him death is a messenger opening the gates of eternal bliss.

II. Who may comfort himself with it.

a. Not the self-righteous.

1. He who imagines he has no sins, or that he can atone for such as he has with his own works.
2. He shall be driven away in his wickedness.

b. But he who is righteous by faith in Christ.

1. The objective righteousness of Christ.
2. This righteousness offered to all in the Gospel.
3. Appropriated by faith.
4. Manifesting itself in newness of life.

TEXT: Isaiah 40, 11. "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd: he shall gather the lambs with his arms, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young."

Christ as the Good Shepherd of whom the Prophet fortold.

I. He is the good Shepherd of your departed child.
   a. Its redemption.
   b. Its regeneration.
   c. Its assumption into glory.
II. He is your own good Shepherd.
   a. It is He who leads you.
   b. He is with you.
   c. He will at last bring you also into the heavenly fold.

TEXT: Matth. 5, 4. "Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted."

What comfort does God's Word afford those who mourn the death of Christian Relatives.

I. It teaches us the blessedness of those who die in the Lord. Rev. 14, 13.
   a. Who are those that die in the Lord.
   b. Why are they blessed.
II. It assures us that all things must work together for good to them that love God. Rom. 8, 28.
   a. The calamities of life and especially the death of our loved ones seem to be misfortunes.
   b. But in the providence of God they are intended for good.
III. It points us to a joyful resurrection at the last day. John 6, 40.
   a. How sad the separation caused by death.
   b. How joyful the meeting on the resurrection morn.

TEXT: Matth. 11, 28. "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

The comforting Word of Christ.

I. To whom it is addressed.
   a. To those who labor.
      1. Under wearisome toil.
      2. Under sickness, pain, and death.

3. Under sorrow and affliction.

b. To those who are heavy laden.

1. There is no load like the load of sin.
2. Look at the publican, David etc.
3. Look at the Savior.

II. What it says.

a. What it asks.

1. "Come," away from sin and all the vanities of the world.
2. "Come to me" by faith, let me be thy Savior.

b. What it affords.

1. Only one thing.
2. But O how sweet is this one thing.

TEXT: Luc. 7, 11-17. The Widow's Son at Nain.

The Christian's Comfort against Death.

I. How much he is need of such comfort.

a. In view of his own death.

1. Death the inevitable end of all flesh.
2. After death the judgment.

b. In view of the death of our loved ones.

1. The tenderest bonds ruthlessly torn asunder.
2. How utterly helpless we stand beside the death-bed of our loved ones.

II. What comfort he has.

a. The sympathy of his friends.

1. We should weep with them that weep.
2. How comforting it is to know that others feel our sorrows with us.

b. The help of the Savior.

1. He sees and knows our sorrow.
2. He has compassion with us.
3. He speaks words of comfort to us.
4. He compels death to give up his prey.
5. He has in store for us a joyful reunion.

TEXT: Luke 16, 19-31. The rich man and Lazarus.

A Glance at the State of Man after Death.

I. Upon what this state depends.

a. Not upon outward circumstances in this world.
1. The happiness of man even in this world does not depend upon outward circumstances.
2. Much less in the world to come, where such circumstances are completely wiped out.

b. But rather upon the condition of the heart.
1. The pious believer goes to life eternal.
2. The selfish worldling goes to hell and torment.

II. What this state is.

a. There is but a twofold state after death.
1. Eternal life and eternal damnation.
2. No intermediate state.

b. This state is unchangeable.
1. No relief to the wicked.
2. No danger of falling away to the righteous.

III. To what it should move us.

a. To care for our own souls.
1. Let us hear Moses and the prophets.
2. Let us not look for other evidence.

b. To warn our fellow-men.
1. Bring them the truth of God's Word.
2. Do so while we can, ere it is too late.

TEXT: Job 1, 21. "The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken way, blessed be the name of the Lord."

How many Christian Parents bless the Name of the Lord upon the Death of a beloved child?

I. They must gratefully acknowledge that the Lord gave the child.

a. What a precious gift.
1. Children are a gift of God.
2. Their true worth in the light of God's Word.

b. How unworthy we are of such a gift.
1. Our sins make us unworthy of the least of God's gifts.
2. How little we appreciate the true worth of children.

II. They must confidently believe that the Lord hath taken away.

a. In what sense this may be said.
1. The child died from natural causes.
2. But it died in the providence of God.

b. What intentions God had in taking it away.
1. Toward the child.
2. Toward the parents.

c. Where he has taken it.
1. To himself in glory.
2. In a little while you shall have it again, as a glorified child in heaven.

TEXT: John 11, 40. "Said I not unto thee, that if thou wouldest believe, thou shouldest see the glory of God.

How the Glory of God is revealed to Faith.

I. In life.
a. What men generally consider a glorious and successful life, is vain and deceitful.
b. The glory of a life spent in the service of God.

II. In suffering.
a. How utterly detestable is suffering in the eyes of the world.
b. How glorious to suffer with the Lord, for His sake and according to His will.

III. In death.
a. To the unbelieving world there is nothing so terrible as death.
b. To the believer it is the gate to Heaven.

TEXT: John 16, 20. "Your Sorrow shall be turned into Joy."

I. What a glorious promise.
a. The sorrow which shall be turned into joy.
b. The joy into which this sorrow shall be turned.

II. To whom it is given.
a. To the Lord's disciples.
b. To them only.

TEXT: Rom. 6, 23. "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

The Duty of the Gospel Ministry towards those who mourn the loss of their beloved ones in death.

I. To speak to them words of admonition.
   a. Showing the true cause of death.
      1. In general: mankind is mortal because it is sinful.
      2. In particular: Often the relation between sin and death, as that of cause and effect lies very near at hand.
   b. Showing the true character of death.
      1. Not the mere end of natural life.
      2. But a summons to judgment and eternal damnation.

II. To speak to them words of comfort.
   a. There is eternal life in spite of sin and death.
      1. Life without end.
      2. A life of perfect happiness.
   b. This life is the gift of God.
      1. No man could possibly merit it.
      2. God bestows it as a free gift.
   c. This gift of God is in His Son.
      1. He merited it.
      2. By faith we may lay hold of it.

TEXT: Phil. 1, 21. "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain."

The Christian view of Life and Death.

I. His view of life.
   a. I live through Christ.
      1. He redeemed me.
      2. He regenerated me.
      3. He has preserved my spiritual life.
   b. I live for Christ.
      1. Not for self or the world.
      2. But for the Lord whose I am and whom I serve.
   c. I live after his pattern.

1. He has lived an exemplary life for me.
2. By the grace of God I follow in his footsteps.

II. His view of death.

a. The world counts death loss.
1. It robs him of everything that he loves.
2. This loss is irredeemable.

b. But to the Christian it is gain.
1. He gains rest and peace.
2. He gains perfect sanctification.
3. He gains eternal joy and bliss.

TEXT: Phil. 1, 23. 24. "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you."

With what disposition does the believing Christian look to the end of his earthly Life?"

I. With joyful anticipations.

a. He has a desire to depart.
1. To leave this world of sin and woe.
2. There is no fear of death but a desire for it.

b. He longs to be with Christ.
1. Here he is but a pilgrim, Heaven is his home.
2. Though Christ is with him even here, yet he longs to see him face to face.

II. With patient resignation.

a. He knows that his life in this world has an object.
1. To prepare for eternity.
2. To serve God in his brethren.

b. Therefore he patiently waits till the Lord calls.
1. He is ready to live even a life of persecution and suffering.
2. He is ready to live or die as the Lord wills.

TEXT: 2 Tim. 2, 11. "It is a faithful saying: For if we be dead with Him, we shall also live with Him."

The Christian's Comfort in Death.

I. Wherein it consists.

a. He dies with his Lord.
1. Christ is his Lord.
2. He dies with his Lord. The blessed results of Christ's death are his by faith. He dies according to the will of Christ. He is willing to die for Christ's sake.

b. He shall live with him.
1. Christ his Lord not only died but rose again.
2. So we also shall rise to life and glory at the last day.

II. Upon what it is founded.

a. The necessity of a good foundation for such a hope.
1. Even in less important matters we seek for good reasons upon which to build our hope.
2. How much more in this most important of all hopes.

b. Such a foundation we have.
1. The apostles says it is a faithful saying and thousands have found it to be so.
2. It cannot be otherwise for it is the Word of God.

II. Who may enjoy it.

a. God intended that all should enjoy it.
1. Christ died for all.
2. The Gospel is preached to all.

b. But in fact it is enjoyed by the believer only.
1. Paul here speaks for himself and his fellow Christians.
2. The wicked have no such hope.

TEXT: Rev. 14, 13. "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me: Write, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them."

The Blessedness of those who die in the Lord.

I. Wherein this blessedness consists.

a. They rest from their labors.
1. Bearing the burdens of life.
2. Fighting the flesh, the world and the devil.

b. Their works do follow them.
1. In this world: the influence of their work goes on.
2. In the world to come: the reward of grace.

II. By whom it is promised.
a. "I heard a voice from heaven."
1. It is not a promise of man, who is impatient and deceitful.
2. But the voice of God.
b. "Saying write."
1. This blessed promise not left to the fickle memory of man.
2. But committed to writing as a "more sure word of prophecy."
c. "Yea saith the Spirit."
1. The written word not the word of man.
2. But given by inspiration of the Spirit of God.

III. To whom it applies.
a. "Blessed are the dead."
1. The world calls the living blessed. To them death is a curse.
2. But we bless the dead.
b. "Which die in the Lord."
1. Not all the dead are blessed.
2. But only those who die in the faith of Jesus Christ.

CURRENT RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

BY PROF. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D., COLUMBUS, O.

Modern theological science and research is not a little proud of the prominence which it gives to the study of the Scriptures as such. In fact, it often claims to be a reaction against the confessional and dogmatical tendencies of older generations and a return to the pure fountain of unadulterated truth. Externally and superficially considered this claim of superiority over the Biblical lore and love of former

days seems to have the semblance of justice. This is certainly an age of Bible work and Bible research. An intense interest is parading the rank and file of the church on the subject of the Scriptures, and it is not a work of supererogation to examine into the character and real profits of modern methods in this work.

Characteristic of these is the fact that the externals of the Scriptures are the chief attractions for the host of modern Biblcal scholars, especially of the critical school. The original character and history of the Biblical books not as the revealed word of truth, but as a literature, prepared and promulgated after the manner of other interesting Oriental literature of the ancient world are the prominent features of the bulk of newer Biblical investigations. The discovery of a new fact in the Assyrian, Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions, or in Egyptian hieroglyphics is hailed with delight, and its existence and bearing impressed upon the Christian public. The archaeology, history, chronology, and similar external features of the Scripture are the points of public prominence now urged, and in proportion the inner contents the teachings of doctrine and revelation, are more and more lost sight of. In regard to the externals of the Bible there has indeed been a great gain in recent times; but it has been secured at the loss, in both theological science in general and in Christian congregations and homes, of that deeper acquaintance with the plan of salvation which forms the sum and substance, the soul and heart of the Scriptures. The great principles of eternal truth as revealed in the Word must be *the* thing for the Bible student, and just in proportion as this is lost sight of by modern Biblical science in its eager search for archaeological and other data of the same kind, the progress is not a gain but a loss.

Again a weakness of modern Biblical research, in which it has progressed backwards over against the Bible knowledge of the Fathers and their generation, is the fact that in urging the necessity of considering the human element in Scripture, the divine is being ignored. One of the nefarious outcomes of this is the denial of the inerrancy

of the Scriptures and of their inspiration, which has found an entrance even in the conservative center. Just what the newer methods of Biblical criticism lead to can be seen by seeing how it undermines one of the pillars and foundations of the Evangelical system of faith, viz: the formal principle of the Reformation, according to which the Word of God is the only and the true and reliable basis for the church, faith and life. In this regard there has been a serious innovation in the character and object of modern biblical work, as far as ends and results are concerned. The question now coming to the forefront is the relation of Christian faith to the Scriptures; the problems whether or not the Scriptures furnish the best and satisfactory basis for the faith of the Church, or whether Christian systems of doctrine should at least in part be built upon other foundations than that of the written Word. Should the formal principle of the Reformation be so modified that not the Scriptures and these alone, but these in conjunction with the subjective principle of Christian consciousness based upon the Word of God as contained in the divine-human Scriptures, are to be made the basis of the Church's faith and teachings? An analysis of modern advanced thought in the theological department will always result in this as the basal problem of the hour: What is to be the attitude of the Church toward the Scriptures in the future?

Of the advanced class of thinkers the best representatives are no doubt the Ritschl men in Germany and their followers, the adherents of the *theologie de la conscience*, or theology of consciousness, of French Protestantism. These aim at a reconciliation of modern theology with modern thought, and expect to do this without the sacrifice of the contents and blessings of the evangelical system of faith, by constructing their system not on the basis of the written Word, but upon a Christian consciousness and conviction inspired by the personality and work of "the historical Christ." It is the picture of the historical Christ that they conjure with, yet "the historical Christ" as understood by them is little, if anything, more than a great and model man, whose preexistence and divine Sonship is denied.

Just what is meant by "the historical Christ," which this

school openly places in antithesis to the Scriptures as the basis of the faith of the Church, can be seen from an exposition of the subject recently published in its organ, the ably edited *Christliche Welt,* of Leipzig, No. 30. This article declared that it cannot be exactly determined who and what Jesus really was, as His disciples had nothing but "impressions" (Eindrücke) of the person of Christ, which were strongly tinged with carnal Messianic notions, and after His death here and there received also a Jewish Apocalyptic coloring. "In the gospels and in the epistles of the New Testament these impressions are retained. We who are living in this age have these representations. We have only the echo (Widerhall), but we have not the words of Christ. We have only a mirror (Spiegel) of His being, reflected out of the souls of others." Over against the Apostles, who were acquainted with Christ personally, the impressions of Christ are now mediately brought to his people. "In accordance with the laws of psychology, such impressions are made upon us with the assistance of the imagination (Phantasie). The pictures which are created in us by the narration of the Life of Christ with the assistance of the imagination form themselves into a general scheme of a total-picture of Christ. This imaginative picture (Phantasiebild) through the continuance and close contemplation of Christ arouses us to love, reverence, enthusiasm, and determination to follow in His footsteps." In this way we have a so-called "ideal" or "imaginative" communion with Christ. Without such impressions there can be no impression of the historical representations. The historical Christ, who has been handed down to us, is a phantasy picture, and can affect us only as such, and only to this image can we come into any relation, because the terrestrial and visible Christ is no longer before us. In so far as Christ has throughout the ages made such "impressions" and still makes them, He is a "living" Christ.

The Ritschl system, which is the new theology of Germany, and is constantly gaining adherents both there and elsewhere, is characterized by a fundamental departure from the landmarks of evangelical Christianity, including the denial of the greatest facts of the Christian system of

doctrine. That these are cast aside is not denied; but the claim is put forth that the acceptance of the preexistence and eternal Sonship of God, of the divinity and virgin birth of Christ, of the Trinity, of the inspiration of the Scriptures and other essentials, as historical facts (Thatsachen) is unnecessary for the production of Christian faith; and that the acceptance of the one great "fact," namely, "the historical Christ," His overwhelming and overpowering personality, is all that is needed. An adherent of this school recently ventured that characteristic statement that "the Church has now learned to walk without the crutches of the Scriptures." The Ritschl school thus aims at a radical reconstruction of the idea, origin, and character of Christian faith, divorcing it from the great historical facts underlying the Gospel history in the life and work of Christ and His disciples, and transferring this faith accordingly from the basis of the written Word to that of subjective and personal consciousness as centered in a "historical Christ," to all intents and purposes shorn of His divine character and work. In perfect consistency with this position is the advocacy of the exclusion of the Old Testament from the Christian education and scholarship, as this is no longer regarded as necessary, and is even considered as dangerous, to a correct understanding of the Christian system.

A characteristic utterance on the actual trend of the critical theology of the day is found in a series of articles entitled "On the Psychology of Faith" in the *Christliche Welt* of recent dates, in which the reconstruction of Protestant theology along altogether different lines from those of Paul, upon which it has been based, is advocated. Among the positions taken are also the following:

"There was and is a great difference between the theology of Paul and the religion of the original Apostles, consisting in this: that the former attempted to develop a dogmatical system, while the latter gave utterance only to thoughts of faith. He, the scribe, came to Christianity with a stock of abstract religious ideas, and began at once to work out, in the shape of propositions, the religious impressions he had secured from Christ. Therefore the life of Christ is disregarded by him. He emphasizes doctrine, and forces his beliefs concerning Christ into the Rabbinic scheme of

systematic thought, without indeed always moving within the world of systems. In his letters he wavers between religion and dogmatics. For him as the scribe just this it was that delighted him, and this too may satisfy many still who are versed in Scripture lore. But evangelical faith in the purest sense of the term can originate only in the Christ of the gospels, not in the dogmatical Christ. This is still the position which Protestantism has not yet been able to discard, namely, establishing itself on the theology of Paul. The Protestant Church must, in order to produce Christian faith and Christ-life, return to the Gospel Christ. Then it will no longer be necessary to exist in attacks and defenses, but can utilize its strength for the positive upbuilding, and thus will be no longer a Protestant but a truly evangelical Church."

The full import and bearing of this new proposition will be seen when it is remembered that the favorite hypothesis on the origin of Christianity in critical circles is this: that primitive Christianity, as promulgated by Christ and His first disciples, was something materially different from that which afterward, largely through the influence of Paul and of Greek phylosophy and *Zeitgeist,* found recognition in the theology of the Church at large.

That largely there is a philosophy at the bottom of these innovations with reference to the Scriptures admits of no doubt. The non-dogma moral system of the Ritschl school, with its exclusion of "metaphysics" from Christian dogmatics, is practically a revival of the Kantian system of knowledge and of ethics. It is, however, only one phase of the naturalistic philosophy of the age, which shows itself in almost every system of Christian science. The ethics now so often urged as independent of a dogmatical basis in Scripture, the theories concerning the origin of Christianity, making it a conglomerate of Jewish and Greek ideas naturally developed, are but further developments of this same fundamental philosophical idea. Here as elsewhere the trend is away from the Scriptural basis and foundation. Modern critical theology, also constantly dealing with the Scriptures, is in reality in its trend and tendancy thoroughly unscriptural and anti-scriptural. Its canons, tenets, and teachings, as developed by its most advanced representatives, undermine the Scriptural basis of the Church's faith. At heart it is a radical and fundamental departure from the formal principle of the Reformation.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. XVI. JUNE, 1896. No. 3.

THE PLACE OF FAITH IN THE ORDER OF SALVATION.

BY PROF. M. LOY, D. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Justification by faith is the cardinal doctrine of the Lutheran Reformation. It is usually called the material principle, as distinguished from the formal principle of the supreme and exclusive authority of God's Word, from which all doctrines of the Church must be drawn and by which alone they can be established and made binding upon human consciences. Since those days of conflict with the Romish apostasy, which denied that the sinner is justified by faith alone and that articles of faith can be derived from the Bible alone, the Ev. Lutheran Church has never wavered in its confession, that nothing but faith can avail to release the sinner from his condemnation and render him acceptable to God. "Being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. 5, 1. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16, 16. The place of faith in the order of salvation as the only and the necessary means of embracing the only Savior, who is the Lord our righteousness, was always regarded as well defined and very plain. We are saved only through Christ, and we can have share in His righteousness only by faith.

But in recent times a theory has been promulgated by men who were recognized as Lutherans and who profess to be Lutherans still, which puts the whole subject in doubt.

It is maintained that God in His inscrutable counsel decides from eternity, as well without regard to faith as without regard to works, who shall be saved, and that these by His power must certainly be brought to salvation. What in the counsel of God is decreed, must be executed. The counsel is called that of election; and the persons whom that infallible counsel has predestinated to salvation are called the elect.

The theory is not a new one in the world. In its substance it was promulgated before the days of the Reformation, and then and since then the Calvinists have said about all in its favor and in its defense which it is possible to say. No doubt it would be very difficult to find any argument produced by the new predestinarians of Missouri which the old Calvinists have not for centuries repeated, and which the Lutheran theologians have not for centuries repeatedly refuted. We are not urging this as proof that the Missouri Synod is necessarily wrong in its Calvinistic new departure, but simply to show that such aberration is the old departure from Lutheranism against which our Lutheran fathers waged warfare with the weapons of God's Word. They clearly saw that this doctrine of the Reformed party is inconsistent with that of the Evangelical Church which set forth the Augsburg Confession, and that its triumph would result in the overthrow of the Lutheran Church with its fundamental doctrine of the means of grace and justification by faith. They therefore carefully examined and thoroughly refuted the arguments of Calvinists. Predestinarianism is therefore not a new thing on earth, the credit of which is due to the enlightenment of this nineteenth century and to the ingenuity of this progressive country. The honor of the invention, if honor should be claimed, does not belong to Missouri.

But it certainly is a new thing that an old heresy, which our old theologians so thoroughly resented when it sought as Reformed doctrine to find favor and gain power in the Lutheran Church, should in these latter days and in this great country, with an audacity that amazes even Americans, parade before the public in Missouri style. It is amazing that the old heresy, lame and limping, should come and

demand that now, when Calvinistic churches themselves are becoming convinced that our old theologians were right in their warfare against the effort to limit the love of the Father and the atonement of the Son and the work of the Holy Ghost to a favored few among our lost race, the Lutheran Church should welcome the bruised and battered old enemy to her bosom. Were it not that the Missouri Synod had gradually become accustomed to dictation and submission, the fact that it complied with the demand would take its place among the other mysteries by which so many have been befogged in the unhappy controversies and divisions which ensued.

The doctrine of the Missouri Synod can hardly be regarded as fixed and settled, so that it could be set forth as a whole in precise language. It is nebulous in conception and vague in expression. There is hardly a point at which it could be attacked without a protest on the part of some that the synod is wronged. And the indistinctness of conception and vagueness of expression stands them in good stead. Some admit what others deny. There is hardly more diversity in the General Synod than there is among the Missourians. Judging from their publications we do them no wrong when we express it as our opinion that almost every shade of doctrine is represented in their synod, from extreme supralapsarian predestinarianism to reckless Semipelagianism. We do not charge the synod with these extremes. For individual opinion, so long as this is not brought before the public, the synod cannot be held fairly responsible. But we can hardly be regarded as uncharitable—we are at least conscious of no such intent or act—when we allege that there is nothing definite in the Missourian doctrine of predestination, unless the general Calvinistic formula that the souls who are elected to salvation are elected to faith, be accepted as the one point in regard to which the whole synod is agreed. We have good reason to doubt even this.

But that brings to view the point to which special attetion is meant to be called in this article.

According to our conviction the doctrine of Missouri, assuming that we are right in finding, at least ostensibly,

the election to faith as a tenet generally accepted in that body, practically discards the doctrine of justification by faith, and puts in its place another that is radically different. To express it briefly, Missouri knows of a justification by grace and election, but of no justification by faith.

We are not conscious of any desire to do Missouri, which by the grace of God has done noble service in the cause of the Gospel and of the Lutheran Church that proclaims the Gospel in all its purity, the least wrong when we say that it has erred in a matter which to Lutherans is essential, and that it has thus forfeited its right to an honorable place among Lutheran synods, although it still vainly asserts the claim to leadership which was once awarded it. Missouri has erred from the truth, and has thus lost the power which it once possessed in the confession and promulgation of that truth. Lutherans can never be brought to believe that salvation is settled by the eternal decree of election, and that faith has nothing to do with it.

The Missourians object to such a statement of the case. We know this. They protest that in their theory faith is necessary just as it is in the doctrine which has been taught in the Lutheran Church since the Reformation. They insist that in their system, if system a scheme may be called that is full of inconsistencies and contradictions, faith is essential to salvation, just as it is in the Bible and in the Lutheran Confession. But they are hardly as candid and as clear as the confessed Calvinists, who maintain the same thing, but who make it plain what is meant, by declaring that those who are absolutely predestined to salvation are uniformly led to their goal through faith as the way in which it has pleased God to lead those whom He has determined to save. Calvinists do not claim that any person can ever be saved otherwise than through faith. But there is something of a trick in the proceeding, and Missourians have learned the trick. Certainly without faith it is impossible to please God and no unbeliever can be saved. It would be useless for Calvinists to deny this before people who read the Bible and know something about faith and salvation. But Missouri, like all Calvinists, assigns a place to faith which the Bible and the Lutheran Church, which confesses

the truth revealed in the Bible, do not assign to it. We are saved through faith, and we are saved through good works, are not two propositions which the Scriptures or our Confessions treat as exactly the same. They pronounce the one true, and show the comfort which poor sinners derive from the truth; they pronounce the other false, and show the misery which is inflicted on poor sinners by the error. When the apostle says: "By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast," (Eph. 2, 8. 9) it is hardly conceivable that any intelligent person should regard the office of faith and that of works to be represented as exactly the same. They are so different that the salvation which is predicated of the one is denied of the other, and in both cases not merely by implication and inference, but directly and expressly. But Missouri and all Calvinists put faith and works precisely on the same level as steps by which those who shall be saved are brought to their goal. For their theory that some believe and some do not, has just as little influence in deciding the question of final salvation as that some do good works and some do not. Why do we express this fact, that seems so injurious to Missourian pretensions? Simply because it is a fact, and Lutherans are required to reckon with it. If Missouri is ashamed of it, as many Calvinists have become ashamed of it, let it renounce its error and mend its ways. Until then let it not foolishly blame us for stating the fact, and warning against the error into which Missouri has fallen.

Plainly the case is this. Missouri maintains that God elects those whom He purposes to save. There is nothing in man, whether a power of nature or a gift of grace, that would in any way exercise any influence on that election. It is absolutely dependent on the supreme will of God, without any foresight of faith or works, or anything that the sinner does or fails to do. The election is made from eternity without the least reference to that which under the economy of grace shall take place in time. Some are chosen to salvation, and the same power that has elected them executes its purpose, and that with as little regard to human will in the execution as in the election. Those whom God deter-

mines to save He saves. But He saves them in the order which He has fixed and which is revealed in the Scriptures. The elect must believe in Christ and be led by His Spirit in the path of good works until the heavenly Jerusalem is reached. Faith is necessary, because that is ordained as the way in which the elect must necessarily walk. But exactly in the same sense are good works necessary as the deeds to be done under divine guidance during the pilgrimage. The elect believe, because that is a necessary result of their election; but they also do good works, because that is a necessary result of their election.

Is that really the place which the Bible and the Lutheran Confession assign to faith? The very question is an offense to those who, in virtue of the Reformation, have learned to appreciate the doctrine of justification by faith.

Missouri had, before it promulgated its Calvinistic error of predestinarianism, in some measure prepared the way for its introduction by teaching a universal justification of sinners through the redemption in Christ Jesus without faith. The truth which underlies this doctrine, that the atonement is complete and does not need any faith or works of men to give it efficacy, rendered it acceptable; and few were induced to oppose the doctrine, because it emphasized the comforting truth of an atonement made for the whole human race, including even those who would not believe and be saved. If any one is lost after the good tidings of salvation in Christ, which is for all people, have been proclaimed, surely it must be his own fault, since in deed and in truth the penalty of sin has been paid. But Missouri has gone wrong and perverted this truth of universal justification in the interest of its particular election. We do not charge that the former was consciously designed as a preparation for the latter. But the confounding of two things to which the same name can, in a general way, be legitimately assigned, because of their intimate relation to each other, certainly answered the purpose of a theory which pushed faith into the background. The perfect obedience of our Lord, in which He actively fulfilled all righteousness as demanded by the law, and passively suffered all the penalty of man's failure to fulfill it, avails for all men. That

can be called a universal justification, because it is declared to be a universal atonement, on the ground of which forgiveness of sins and eternal life are proclaimed to all men. But the metonymical phrase, which involves a precious truth, can easily be perverted in the service of error. The faith which forms an integral part of the whole divine plan, according to the divine summary given of it in the Scriptures, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life," may be overlooked or purposely kept out of view, notwithstanding the great prominence which the Bible gives it. In consequence of this Universalists can set up the delusive claim of salvation for all, and Calvinists can just as delusively set up the claim of salvation for only a select few; for in neither case is it dependent on faith. In one case it is salvation according to the purpose of God which is presumed to embrace all; in the other it is salvation according to the purpose of God which is presumed to embrace only a favored few. In both cases the sinner is accepted without regard to faith. Nothing is requisite to salvation but the mercy of God that provided a Savior and the work of Christ that atoned for our sins: the work of the Holy Ghost has no decisive influence in the result. Those whom God in His mercy desires to save will be saved by His power, without reference to the attitude which individuals might assume towards the revelation of the divine will and to the requirements which are made. The theory solves all difficulties by the general averment, that when God means to save a soul He sees to it that all which He has been pleased to require is brought about by His almighty power, which feeble mortals would strive in vain to resist.

We need not ask intelligent Christians to inquire whether, if all depends simply on the will of God, Universalism is not the legitimate outcome of the theory, and Calvinism, whether in its coarser form of Supralapsarianism or in its milder form of Sublapsarianism and Missourianism, is not, in the light of the Gospel, which declares mercy for all poor sinners and atonement for them all, plainly a most miserable travesty of that gracious revelation in Christ that

bids us to believe and be of good cheer. If by universal justification is meant that all shall really be saved in virtue of the satisfaction rendered by our blessed Lord, we have only to point to the decision of God, that "he that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." If by universal justification is meant that the way is prepared for the salvation of all by the satisfaction rendered to divine righteousness, and that therefore those whom God wants to save can be accepted without any violation of divine righteousness and admitted into the glories of heaven, we must again point to the decision of the Lord of all that "he that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." When the necessity of faith as a subjective means of salvation is discarded, Universalism has the advantage in every way; for nothing is more clearly and directly and emphatically set forth in the revelation of God for our salvation than that in His mercy He would have all men to be saved.

Why should a revelation be given us at all, or should the office of preaching be instituted, if God by His absolute will decided all, without any reference to the wills with which He has endowed His intelligent creatures, who sinned and are responsible for their sin? Those whom He has the will to save would be saved anyhow; and if erring thoughts led any poor mortals to suppose that there are some whom He does not want to save, what good, in their view, would any preaching of mercy and redemption and salvation do them? They could not be saved in any case. Preaching the Gospel would not save those who shall be saved anyhow, and it could not save those who shall be lost anyhow. It would be a superfluous thing, and its execution could only be the performance of a ceremonial law, in which our obedience could be exercised, but by which no salutary results could be attained. Indeed, the whole Gospel would thus become a ceremonial affair, because God in His secret counsel has determined and settled beforehand everything in regard to every individual's salvation and the stages through which the execution of the decree proceeds can have nothing to do with the decree itself or have any decisive influence on the result. The command to repent and believe on the

Lord Jesus Christ is obeyed by those who are elected to faith, because the decree of election provides for that; it is not obeyed by those who are not predestinated to salvation, because, as consistent Calvinists boldly assert, though Missourians have not the courage to assert it and are therefore not consistent in their Calvinism, the decree of election does not provide for their believing, as it does not provide for their salvation. In either case the believing or not believing has nothing to do with the result, which is all settled beforehand without regard to faith, as it is all settled beforehand without regard to works. Both are necessary in the sense that God leads His people through them to glory; both are unnecessary in the sense that the question of salvation is settled without regard to their presence or absence.

Can any Lutheran, who has learned the doctrine of justification by faith and who has experienced, as did Luther, the unspeakable comfort of this central truth, admit that this gives faith its proper place in the economy of salvation? We cannot think it.

THE RELATION OF JOHN'S BAPTISM TO THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST.

TRANSLATED FROM PHILIPPI'S "GLAUBENSLEHRE," BY REV. PROFESSOR L. H SCHUH, A. M., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Concerning the Scripture doctrine of Holy Baptism, we will pass by the Old Testament types and prophecies and consider at once the declarations of the New Testament itself, in which this sacrament first found its direct institution. In doing this we are in the first place referred to the question concerning the essence of John's baptism and its relation to the baptism of Christ. For according to Luke 3, 2 ff. the Word of God came to John in the wilderness, and in consequence of it he preached the baptism of repentance unto the forgiveness of sins. John 1, 33 he himself says expressly that God sent him to baptize with water, and Matt. 21, 25 Jesus plainly demands of the Sanhedrists as an an-

swer to His question that the baptism of John was from heaven and not of men. It was, therefore, water comprehended in the Word of God, namely in the Word of divine institution and of divine command.

In order to determine what effective power it carried in itself, we must go back to the position and testimony of the Baptist, for the efficacious content of his testimony must also have been the efficacious content of his water-baptism sealing the same, of the Word clothed in the water of baptism. It must now be pronounced an erroneous conception, when John is considered the last but greatest Old Testament prophet, since the old covenant reached its permanent and final close through Malachi, the last of the Old Testament prophets. John stands not at the end of the old covenant, but at the beginning of the new, which he opened as the forerunner and harbinger of Christ upon whom he pointed with his finger. As such he stood in fact higher than all the prophets of the old covenant, though he in his humility called himself only the voice in the wilderness. Therefore Mark 1, 1 ff. calls the entrance of John upon his work, the beginning of the gospel; our Lord Himself calls John who is more than a prophet, the greatest of those born of women, the angel who prepares His way, and says that from the days of John the Baptist the kingdom of heaven suffers violence and the violent take it by force as well as that the law and the prophets have prophesied until John, with whom therefore prophecy passed into fulfillment, Matt. 11, 9-13. Also Acts 1, 22 compared with 10, 37; 13, 24 the entrance of John upon his work is designated as the initial epoch of the working of Christ. The Baptist himself mentions the purpose of his baptismal office, the revealing of Jesus unto Israel as the Christ, the Son and Lamb of God, as which He was sealed to himself (John) through the visible descent of the Holy Ghost at His baptism in Jordan, so that He whose near impending advent he had thus far declared, might be declared as the now present Savior in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, John 1, 29-36, who gives eternal life to all who believe on Him, John 3, 36. Therefore the evangelist characterizes the whole commission of the Baptist as comprehended in this that he should bear witness

of the light, that all through him might come to faith in the light, John 1, 7 f. We see from this that the repentance which the Baptist preached consisted not only in the knowledge of sin, but also in faith, as also Luke 3, 18 ascribes evangelizing to him and 3, 8, comp. Matt. 3, 8, he demands the positive fruits of repentance which proceed from faith alone. For the angel already before his birth had declared of him, that he would convert many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God, and Zacharias after his birth exults and announces of him that he would mediate unto the people the knowledge of salvation, which consists in the forgiveness of sin, Luke 1, 16, 77. If now already the word of his sermon produced repentance and faith, namely faith in the coming one, i. e. in Jesus Christ, comp. Acts 19,4 and by means of this faith the knowledge of salvation, forgiveness of sins, conversion and the fruits of sanctification, then certainly his baptism confirming his word could have had no other object and no less effect. It is impossible for the baptism of repentance for the remission which John preached, comp. Mark 1, 4, Luke 3, 3, to signify a baptism obligating to a change of mind, in order that through repentance one be prepared for it, but the forgiveness of sins be received in the future from the Messiah, so Meyer and others teach; but the baptism of repentance as appears from Matt. 3, 11 "I baptize you with water unto repentance," must be a baptism which is destined to work this change of mind, and what above all is the chief thing, this baptism of repentance itself tends to the forgiveness of sins, so according to older exegetes, von Hoffmann, de Wette, Ewald. This is also confirmed by the like sounding expression used of Christian baptism, "to be baptized for the remission of sins" Acts 2, 38, and it is arbitrary to understand this once of the actually presented forgiveness of sins and the next time of that forgiveness which is only in prospect. If the Baptist through the Word and sacrament could only bring about a knowledge of sin and not a forgiveness of sin, then he was only a preacher of the law not a witness of Christ, and if at his time there was yet no forgiveness of sins, much less was there before him forgiveness of sin under the Old Covenant, which conflicts with the clear testimony of all the Old

Testament believers. Or had Apollos, who knew only of the baptism of John, no forgiveness of sin though it is written of him, and "being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord," Acts 18, 25? So also we read Luke 7, 30: "the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, inasmuch as they did not permit themselves to be baptized of John." The baptism of John must thus be considered as a true realization of the counsel of God unto salvation. If our Lord through the reception of baptism in Jordan consecrated the baptismal water, and then through the hand of His disciples permitted baptism without doubt in His name and for the efficacious reception unto His fellowship, then at least from there on this efficacious power cannot be denied the continued baptism of John which ran parallel with this baptism of Christ. John 3, 22 f. Now we nowhere read that the baptism of John before the baptism of Jesus in Jordan had less power than afterwards. That the baptism of John effected regeneration our Lord Himself declares. When He, John 3, 5, says to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven," there is manifestly in this a reference back to the baptism of John. For no other baptism was known to Nicodemus, nor did it indeed exist at that time. As the baptism of John brought forgiveness of sins, so also the spirit of regeneration, which according to the plan of salvation is inseparably and indissolubly united with forgiveness of sins, as Apollos fervent in the spirit, must have received the spirit through the baptism of John.

On account of this essential identity of its workings with the workings of Christian baptism, it was not necessarily demanded for those who had received this. Undoubtedly all the apostles were prepared for Christ by the Baptist, and by him they were baptized. The personal election of Christ did not with them take the place of baptism, for this election was a special election to the apostolate; as also Paul who was immediately called and chosen of the Lord to this office must yet be baptized. Also the pouring out of the Spirit on the festival of Pentecost was to them not a surrogate of Christian baptism, for this was the spirit of charis-

matic endowment, which also later was imparted by the laying on of hands to those who already through baptism had received the spirit of regeneration. Comp 8, 12. 14-17; yea, by way of exception it fell upon Cornelius and his household before baptism as a sign that also the gentiles were admitted to the baptism of regeneration, Acts 10, 44-48; 11, 15 ff. As little as we read concerning the apostles that they were baptized again, so little also of Apollos, who knew only of the baptism of John, but Aquila and Priscilla explained to him more fully the way of God which he before had taught exactly, since the teaching of the Baptist did not contain the gospel of Christ in its whole rich development, but only in germ. Acts 18, 25 f. Finally the apostle Peter says in his first letter 3, 21, that baptism saves us. This salvation the baptism of John brought him for his person, which he alone had received, for that Peter was baptized immediately by Christ Himself, is an entirely untenable position expressly contradicted by John 4, 2: "Though Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples."

As the reception of Christian baptism was not necessarily demanded after the reception of the baptism of John, so it was not on the other hand absolutely excluded by it. It was not demanded since also the baptism of John was also water comprehended in God's Word, in the Word of divine institution and in the Word of the divine promise of Christ the Son and Lamb of God, which brought to all who believed it the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the work of reconciliation during the activity of John was yet in process of development, and was not completed until the death and resurrection of the Lord. Therefore the testimony of the person and work of our Lord which was sealed through Christian baptism, was clearer, more developed and richer than the testimony of the Baptist, and corresponding to this the certainty of salvation worked through Christian baptism was firmer and the workings of the Spirit mediated through it were stronger and fuller than was the case with the baptism of John. If now, as was the case with an Apollos, the consequent evangelical instruction unfolded the *verbum visibile* and permitted the gifts of salvation imparted by it to come into full power and

completed the certainty of salvation warranted by it, or if, as was the case with the apostles, the miraculous gifts of grace could seal the covenant of grace already made in the baptism of John; so on the other hand nothing prevented to execute this confirming and sealing through Christian baptism following after. In fact, the latter must be considered the rule, the former the exception, as also the apostles on the first festival of Pentecost baptized all the three thousand on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, of whom certainly the majority had received the baptism of John without first exploring and discriminating. Neither can it be said that those who were baptized by John alone had but a half a baptism, nor that those who afterward received Christian baptism were re-baptized. To the former the word following after offered the full unfolding of all the gifts of grace already contained in their baptism as in a germ; to the latter Christian baptism alone offered the full confirmation of that grace which they had already received through the baptism of John. True a peculiar relation exists here such as was possible only in those first times of transition, but which later must cease of its own accord. For between the baptism of John and Christian baptism although they were essentially alike there was a difference in degree, but since Christian baptism contains the highest in grade and most complete confirmation and sealing of baptism, a repetition of it was not only useless, but also sacreligious because it involved an anti-scriptural doubt as to the divine and once for all valid significance of the first baptism and as to its full effective power.

If now John, comp. Matt. 3, 11; Mark 1, 8; Luke 3, 16, says of himself that he baptizes with water, but He coming after him would baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire; he, according to what has thus far been developed, cannot possibly have meant to deny to his baptism every working of the Spirit proceeding from Christ. Rather does he place his person over against that of Christ and subordinates himself to Christ. I for my person, he means to say, cannot stand on a level with Christ, I am only His servant and attendant and I have the power according to the office committed unto me by my own strength to impart

only water-baptism; He on the contrary will show Himself as the Lord and Christ in this that He will baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire. This promise was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, Acts 2, 1-4, where the Holy Spirit in an audible and visible manner was poured out upon the disciples and descended upon them in the form of tongues of fire, which outpouring proceeding from Jesus, comp. v. 33, sealed Him as the Lord and Christ. This conception is confirmed by the occasion which according to the report of Luke 3, 15 gave rise to the dictum of the Baptist. For when the people believed that John himself was Christ, he must to rob them of this foolish notion point out the fact that he, of whom it is expressly reported that he did no miracles, comp. John 10, 41, could do nothing but to offer the water-baptism, that on the contrary He who was the true Christ would prove this by the greatest of all miracles, the baptism with the Spirit and fire, comp. also John 1, 26 and Hengstenberg on this passage. This does not exclude that the same Christ put into the baptism of John His invisible spirit-power and spirit-working, only that the same as invisible could not be adduced as a proof of His Messiahship. For not only does the Lord say there 1, 5 to His disciples before His ascension referring back to the testimony of the Baptist and announcing its fulfillment at the festival of Pentecost so nearly at hand, that John baptized with water but that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence: but Peter also testifies 11, 15 ff. that upon Cornelius and his household the Holy Ghost fell (with His wonderful charismata, comp. 10, 44-46) even as upon the apostles at the first beginning (of Pentecost) and then he thought of the Word of the Lord Jesus, when He (1, 5) said: John baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. But it was just Cornelius and his household who experienced a repetition of the Pentecost miracle, inasmuch as the spirit of the miraculous gifts sealing the preaching of Peter concerning Christ was communicated to them, even before they had received the spirit of regeneration in holy baptism, as vice versa the miracle-spirit of Pentecost was poured out upon the disciples, after the spirit of regeneration had been imparted to them by the baptism of John.

Finally Acts 19, 1-7 does not contradict the acceptation of the essential identity of the baptism of John and of Christian baptism in spite of a difference of degree. At Ephesus Paul finds twelve disciples whom he asks whether they had received the Holy Ghost when they came to faith. Since Luke designates them as disciples and Paul as believers, we are at the outset pointed to the fact that they were Christians. That they as believers could not have received the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit the apostle could impossibly preface on account of the indissoluble connection of faith and regeneration. His question concerning the receiving of the Holy Spirit cannot refer to the spirit of regeneration, but only to the spirit of the gift of miracles. If then they answer, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost," they do not wish in general to express their ignorance of the existance of the Holy Spirit, but only in view of the existence of this charismatic spirit of miracles. The former is certainly also unthinkable with the disciples of John, who as such were indisputably Jews and in Ephesus lived in communion with Christians. In the same sense we already found "Holy Spirit" in Mark 1, 8; Acts 1, 5. 8; 15 ff.; 10, 44 ff.; 11, 15 ff.; 15, 8; and also in John 7, 39 which in expression is analogous to our passage: "For the Holy Ghost was not yet given: because that Jesus was not yet glorified." Further then Paul asks the disciples at Ephesus upon what they were baptized? For since the spirit of miracles, as the Baptist himself testified, was not conferred by the baptism of John, but was first communicated by Christian baptism, this question naturally arose. They answered: Upon the baptism of John. Upon this the apostle answered, that John indeed administered only the baptism unto repentance and demanded of the people faith in the one coming after him, namely Jesus Christ. With the abbreviated way of narrating of Luke the addition naturally supplies itself from the context, that accordingly the Spirit first poured out by the exalted Christ was not yet present with His wonderful gifts of grace, and that it was not yet imparted by the baptism of John. When the disciples of John heard this, they permitted themselves to be baptized upon the name of Jesus, namely as the one having

come and having been exalted, and when Paul laid his hands upon them the Holy Ghost came upon them and they spake with tongues and prophesied, by which plainly is expressed that the Holy Spirit, which is here in question, was the pneuma of glossology and prophecy. Just as little can it be concluded from this passage that the baptism of John did not communicate the spirit of regeneration as that Christian baptism was absolutely necessary after the reception of the baptism of John. Only this may be concluded that Christian baptism might be administered after the baptism of John, and that it must be administered there or at least was regularly administered there where the miraculous gifts of the Spirit were to be received, from which, so far as can be proved, only the disciples were an exception. Of Apollos on the contrary we do not read that he was baptized anew as also Aquila and Priscilla could not by the laying on of hands impart to him the charismatic spirit of miracles, which prerogative only the apostles enjoyed. Probably those twelve disciples at Ephesus were to be set apart for congregational service and Paul therefore considered it proper to mediate to them through the laying on of hands the chrism of glossology and prophecy. Comp. 1 Tim. 4, 14; 2 Tim. 1, 6. To the relation between the baptism of John and Christian baptism already explained, and the laying on of hands connected only with the latter and producing the wonderful chrisms of the spirit, the expression and juxtaposition "of the doctrine of baptism" and "of laying on of hands," Heb. 6, 2 undoubtedly refers.—Finally when we so sharply separate the spirit of regeneration and the spirit of miracles, we do not at all wish to question that the spirit of miraculous chrisms as it received a visible confirmation of regeneration received in baptism, as well as that it augmented these gifts of regeneration itself and permitted them to pass into strong activity; but only that this was not always the necessary consequence. For not only did Cornelius and his household receive the gift of speaking with tongues before regenerating baptism, but just as exceptionally can this gift of miracles be imparted to such who do not stand in justifying faith and never attain it. Comp. Matt. 7, 22 f.; 1 Cor. 13, 2.

OUR MORNING SERVICE.

BY REV. E. G. TRESSEL, A. M., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

It is hoped that a short analysis of our Morning Service may be of use in leading to a fuller appreciation of it and more joy in taking part in it. The idea is not an historical essay, but a short statement of its parts and their order and union, that we may see the plan of God in His grace for man reflected in the service in which we all unite every Lord's day. The Christian loves God's house, the place where His honor dwelleth. Above all the minister loves it. He goes to it with a message of Jehovah to His redeemed people, and the whole hour of worship is to him the joy and rejoicing of his heart.

He realizes that God is there and that He is to be known in His palaces; that the voice of prayer, praise and thanksgiving becometh the house of the Lord. Neither is he alone in the devotion, but the company of God's people have gone up together and all hearts wish to unite in the services of God's house, and hear God speak to them. What has the service to say about these things? Does it represent God's will to the world, so that all may see His gracious plan for sinful man's deliverance, and also afford the redeemed and justified sinner adequate opportunity to praise, extol and supplicate that God who has given and preserves to him the means of grace? A statement of the parts will answer this question better than any affirmation.

It may be arranged into the following heads:

I.

1. Introit with Gloria Patri.
2. Confession with Kyrie.
3. Announcement of Grace with Chant.

II.

1. Salutation with response.
2. Epistle with response.
3. Gospel with response.

4. Collect.
5. Creed.
6. Hymn.

III.

1. Sermon.
2. General Prayer.
3. Hymn.
4. Benediction.

The purpose is to have the whole responsive; that is, the minister and congregation to alternate in the service. This is carried out in fair consistency, culminating with Creed and Lord's Prayer in recitation in unison.

PART I.

1. The Introit. The introit, as here presented, has two parts. The minister steps before the altar and solemnly announces that the service shall begin and be carried on *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* The congregation at once takes up the thought of the presence of the Holy Trinity and in view of His goodness and grace thus vouchsafed, glorifies God: *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.* By this glory the people have recognized the eternal sonship of the Son and also the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost, thereby accepting all the Church has gained in her controversy with error.

2. Confession with Kyrie. The confession starts with the assumption that all men are wicked, and then states that the wicked will be saved by turning away from this wickedness; this turning is a matter of the heart; and God offers mercies and forgivenesses in the face of this rebellion. Therefore we ought to confess our sins to God, humbly and sincerely, that we may enjoy His mercy and forgiveness. The sinner has to do with God who knows all hearts and whose laws are not only just and good but necessary. Man has erred because he is a sinner; has grieved God because he has followed his own heart and broken His laws, both by omission and commission. Man is a sinner and does

sinful things. In the sight of God he cannot stand. But God does not hate His creatures, but wants the sinner to return. Spare and restore those, O God, who grieve over sin, as is promised in Christ, and lead them to holiness of life to the praise of Thy name. This is a deep and wonderful petition, and every burdened soul can join in it, and with mingled tears and joy take up the Kyrie: *O God the Father in heaven, etc.*

The Kyrie is not a confession of sin; that has taken place already. It makes that confession the individual's own, and asks for the peace that comes only from sins forgiven, and for strength to bear the misery of sin which, though forgiven, is a burden through life.

3. Announcement of Grace with Chant. By some this is called an absolution, but can only be such in the same way as the declaration of the Gospel is. For here we have the full measure of God's grace in the order of salvation and its offer to those sinners who have confessed.

a. God's universal Benevolence.

1). His love for fallen man. "Hath had mercy upon us," even in eternity had mercy, as He foresaw man's fall.

2). His provision to restore man. "And hath given His only Son to die for our sins."

3). Result of this gift. "And doth for His sake graciously pardon us." All are redeemed, and all can have its blessings, if they will accept the proffered grace.

b. God's special Benevolence.

1). *Manner* by which forgiveness provided for all is bestowed. "He also giveth unto all them that believe in His name the power to become His children," etc., faith, regeneration, Holy Spirit.

2). Means—faith and baptism—the old service has—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

3). Praise to the Lord that this mercy is now applied to the individual.

After this declaration, which is thus set forth to show its gospel fulness, the congregation takes up the praise of the divine mercy in the chant. The Gloria in Excelsis is the one generally used in the chief service. It is usually introduced by the pastor with the words: "Glory be to God on high." They have gone down into the depths of sin, and now they rise to the heights of God's glory as sung by the angels. This is called the Gloria Major as the Gloria Patri is called Gloria Minor.

With the chant the first part is ended. The heart has been prepared for the Word, and now proceeds to it. The sacrificial element will now largely give way to the sacramental.

PART II.

1. The Salutation introduces the sacramental part of the service. As the angel to the virgin, Luke 1, 28, Christ, through His minister, salutes us when He will make His abode within us. The Response follows, as seen in Ruth 2, 4 and 2 Tim. 4, 22.

The Scripture lessons are two, as in the Old Testament service a lesson from the Law and one from the prophets was read.

2. The Epistle. It is the Word of the Christian law, as set forth in the New Testament. It is the statement of men of God of the work that the Lord has done in His Church and of the regulation of the holy life. The congregation sees the value of this word, and its necessity to the soul and implores its saving power: *Sanctify us, O Lord, through Thy truth, Thy Word is truth.*

3. Gospel. Here Christ Himself speaks, and the facts of the day celebrated are clearly set forth, such as Christmas, Easter, etc. The people, grateful for the day and the message from the Lord, sing a doxology as a fitting response to the gospel: *Praise be to Thee, O Christ.*

4. The Collect. All are supposed to unite in it; it is a prayer of pastor and people. "It embraces one main petition, consists of but one sentence, asks through the merits of Christ, and ends with an ascription to the Holy Trinity."

5. *Creed.* This is a summary of the faith as a whole,

and calls it into view before the preacher develops the part for the day. All unite in repeating it as the confession of their faith.

6. Hymn. Here a hymn of general import, that brings up the facts of the season, is in place. While the people sing it, the minister, though joining them, is breathing out a prayer for divine wisdom and strength to divide rightly the word of truth and to lead souls to Christ and comfort them in Him.

PART III.

The Sermon. Here God speaks through His servant. Therefore the minister will not take that which may personally best please himself or most suit the individuals of the flock, but will let God plead His own cause by His Word as it appears in Gospel and Epistle with all that is needed for faith and holiness.

2. General Prayer. The sermon ended, the people rise, and the minister presents the cause of the people and especially of the Church as the communion of saints before the throne of God. All sorts and conditions of people are remembered, and the whole cause of the kingdom is considered in the blessings asked for all nations. God's blessings and protection are implored, and is all summed up in the Lord's Prayer, in which all humbly and reverently unite.

3. Then a hymn that applies the sermon is sung. People have praised the Lord, He has spoken to them in Word and sermon, and they are now ready to depart to their homes. At the close of the hymn they rise and sing a doxology, and the minister gives them the parting blessing of the Lord in

4. The Benediction, which abides upon them as they quietly go to their respective abodes.

It may not be out of place to say a few things about the minister's part in rendering this service.

He should be reverent. This ought to be evinced in manner and tone. Without mock solemnity or anything to distract the worshipper, he should be dignified, earnest, fervent and spiritually minded.

He should be *prepared* to read. Every part ought to

be ready. The service, gospel and epistle ought to be studied. There is no excuse for the minister to mispronounce words in the regular service. Why has he had training, and why has he a dictionary and the facility of its use? It is the minister's work to make people understand God's will. Neh. 8, 8. One of the most necessary things in good reading is proper emphasis. Not only in the service, but also in epistle and gospel, but especially in the hymns, the thought can be made to stand forth clearly by the use of right emphasis. Public readers give years to the study of emphasis, that they may adequately represent the thought of their authors.

A little judicious and careful study will enable any minister to render the service acceptably. As a test of his power and a spur to his knowledge, let him try his hand on these specimens. "We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done." "Spare Thou those, O God, who confess their faults." Also the Third Article of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, as well as many of the gospels and epistles. After a reader knows what word or words bear the emphasis, his task is only half done. How are these words to be made to carry the burden of the thought in the rendering? While there is much chance for individual judgment and preference, there are certain principles as fixed and sure as the rules of grammar. The methods of emphasizing words can be enumerated as follows: force, stress, quality, pitch, inflection, time, and pause. The least desirable and most practical is force; the most satisfactory and instructive, but almost wholly disregarded by preachers, is inflection. "True art is to conceal art," and the rendering of the service ought to be so smooth and free from defect or just criticism, that the hearer forgets the manner of the rendering in attention to the will of God, which is pushed upon the heart for reception. The preacher ought to have himself and voice under such control, and the work to be done so much in his power, that he can wholly forget the manner and style, and be fully absorbed in the will of God he is giving to the people. He should therefore not practice before or upon the people; but as the sermon is ready

before he goes before his people to deliver it, so should he be ready with intellect, voice, and all that go to enable him rightly to represent what he has to read, before he stands up to lead God's people in the worship of His sanctuary.

Who can tell how many of the educated and thoughtful have been turned away from God's house and service before the Holy Spirit in His Word had opportunity to reach the conscience and heart, by the careless and uninteresting rendering of the service by the minister who can be presumed to be trained! As soon as a man can so render the service that people forget him in the message he carries, he has gained the day. Should less be asked of the Lord's anointed? I once heard a minister read:

Welcome news to Zion bearing,
  Zion long in hostile (long i) lands:
Morning (not mourning) captive,
  God Himself will lose (not loose) thy bands.

And the choir took it up and sang:

Zion long in hostile lands:
  Morning captive,
God Himself will lose thy bands.

I could recount many such mistakes, from the introit to the benediction, that have come under my own observation, but it almost seems to border on the sacrilegious to repeat them.

In conclusion, a word about the singing of the chants. On the whole, it seems to me, they are sung generally with too much volume, both in voice and organ; especially is this true of the Kyrie, which is much better if rendered in a subdued power, as if the burden of the soul made it weep.

THE SABBATH IN GENESIS AND EXODUS.

BY P. A. PETER, WEST BALTIMORE, OHIO.

I.

It is a common belief that the Sabbath, next to the estate of matrimony, is the oldest institution given to man in Eden, by his Creator, and that the Sabbath day was observed by our first parents whilst they remained in a state of innocence. It is generally taken for granted that the Sabbath had its origin in Paradise, before the Tempter entered therein to lead Adam and Eve away from God, and to bring sin and every evil into the world. It is almost universally held that the Sabbath was kept by our first parents, and by all the patriarchs, before Moses, as a divinely-ordained institution, which was confirmed in the written law given on Mt. Sinai to Israel. All this is so confidently asserted by the overwhelming majority of professing Christians, that it may appear as rash to question the correctness of these assertions, or even to examine, what to so many appears to be self-evident.

But inasmuch as we are told to prove all things, and to hold fast to that which is good (1 Thess. 5, 21), let us therefore carefully consider the popular opinion that the seventh day of the week was universally observed by the patriarchs from the creation to the giving of the Law on Sinai, and that this was done in agreement with Genesis 2, second and third verses, which read as follows: "And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made: and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all His work, which God created and made." We do not here read that God gave Adam *a command* to observe the seventh day or to keep it holy. There is no command, law, order or injunction given to man in these words. Dr. Schaff, who in 1863, wrote a tract with the title, "The Anglo-American Sunday," and who held to the common opinion, that the Sabbath had its origin in Paradise, and is therefore an institution in-

tended for all men, in all times, himself admits in this tract, "it" (the institution of the Sabbath), "is originally no legal requirement." (I follow the German translation by Rev. J. G. Zahner). By this admission Dr. Schaff destroyed the force of Genesis 2, 2. 3 as a proof that the keeping of the Sabbath is therein commanded. For if the keeping of the Sabbath was not a "legal requirement," a part of the law written in the heart of Adam, in Paradise, how can it be a legal requirement now? What was not written in the heart of man at his creation cannot have become a "legal requirement" since he fell.

It is evident that Gen. 2, 2. 3 does not contain a law or a legal requirement, but that the great truth is there recorded that God having finished the work of creation, regarded it with supreme pleasure, and rested in Himself the seventh day and sanctified it, "because that in it He had rested from all His work, which God created and made." The passage is historical, relating what God did on the seventh day. He had finished the work of creation, but His work of providence continued.

To attempt to draw the inference from this passage, that because God rested on the seventh day and sanctified it, it is therefore a perpetual institution, binding upon the consciences of all men, at all times, appears to me as a *petitio principii.*

Sebastian Schmidt says in his Annotations on Genesis, that it is generally held (i. e. by the old Lutheran theologians), that the fall of man occurred already on the sixth day of the week, hence before God rested on the seventh day and sanctified it. The words of Holy Writ do not militate against this view. It is evident that the first chapter of Genesis and chapter 2, v. 1-3, contain a summary account of the creation. In the second chapter, beginning with the fourth verse, Moses takes up the sixth day of creation, describing more particularly the creation of the first man, and the description of Paradise, together with the command given Adam, the forming of the woman, and their condition of innocence. Then follows the third chapter, telling of man's transgression and fall, which may have already occurred on the sixth day, hence before the Sabbath.

It is evident that Gen. 2, 1-3, is an appendix to the first chapter, and that what is written in the second chapter from v. 4 to 25, must have occurred before what is said in v. 1 to 3 of the same chapter. In the third chapter the narrative runs on like the links of an unbroken chain, from man's temptation to his expulsion from Paradise. We have thus one complete unbroken narrative from man's creation to his departure from Eden, and from all this it is far from being unscriptural and unhistorical to affirm, that in point of time Gen. 2, 1-3 follows after Gen. 3, 1-24. On the contrary, I firmly believe that this position is strictly scriptural and historical, and that man had already fallen when God rested on the seventh day and sanctified it.

But whether we adopt this position or not, it is clear that the passage, Gen. 2, 2. 3, does not imply a command, or a divine legal requirement, according to which the first man was in conscience bound to observe the seventh day of the week as a day of rest and worship. The plain historical statement that God rested on that day, and sanctified it, cannot be interpreted to mean a command or injunction, without doing violence to the text.

In addition to this, it must also be kept in mind, that there is not a single instance or example mentioned in Genesis that would go to show that the patriarchs observed the Sabbath day. We read many examples of religious exercises, such as Cain and Abel and others bringing offerings and sacrifices unto the Lord, of men calling upon Him, or calling themselves by His name, of Noah preaching righteousness, of Abraham practicing circumcision by God's command, and the like, but we find no example of the religious observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath, although the patriarchs may have divided time by a week of seven days. Is it not reasonable to suppose that if the Sabbath day was kept by the patriarchs, there would be some allusion to the fact in Genesis in the period extending from the creation of the world to the death of Joseph,—a period of over 1,600 years?

The offerings and sacrifices brought unto the Lord in the patriarchal age were no doubt brought unto Him in compliance with a divine, positive, ceremonial law, and not

in compliance with the law written in the heart of the first man at his creation. Hence even if it were true that the Sabbath was observed by the patriarchs, it could only have been observed upon the ground of a positive, ceremonial law, similar to the law of offerings and sacrifices. But all ceremonial laws and ordinances have been abrogated under the new and better covenant, with Christ as its Mediator.

In order to bind the consciences of men to the observance of any religious duty, clear and plain passages of Holy Writ must be produced. Now, as Gen. 2, 2. 3 cannot be construed into a divine command without doing violence to language, and as there is no instance or example given in Genesis, that the patriarchs observed the Sabbath, it is wrong to bind the consciences of men to keep the seventh day, as the Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh Day Adventists do. The Puritans, who have adopted the theory, that the Sabbath was "transferred" from the seventh to the first day of the week, by a supposed command of the Lord, or of the Apostles, or of the Church, interpret Gen. 2, 2. 3 just as the Sabbatarians. Roman Catholics base the observance of Sunday on a direct, positive command or law of the Church. Sabbatarians, Puritans and Roman Catholics are legalists.

To make the inference that the words "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy" (Exod. 20, 8), refer to Gen. 2, 2. 3, as a command given at the creation, is an entirely arbitrary and unwarrantable assumption. God does not say, "Remember the *commandment* of the Sabbath to keep it holy," but, "Remember the Sabbath *day* to keep it holy." The word "remember" emphasizes the time when the commandment was given on Mt. Sinai, as something to be kept in mind,—something to be continually aware of. In Deut. 5, 12-15 the word "remember" does not occur. When it is said in Gen. 20, 11, "the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it," these words no more imply a command to all men to keep that day, than Gen. 2, 2. 3 commanded Adam to keep it. The observance of the particular seventh day pertained to the Jews only. The Sabbath was a sign between God and the children of Israel. Exodus 31, 12-17.

If the explanation should be preferred, that the word

"remember" in the Sabbath commandment, refers to a previous command, it would be much more natural to refer it to Exod. 16, 23-30, than to Gen. 2, 2. 3.

Having shown that there is no divine command in Genesis concerning the keeping of the Sabbath day, and that no instance is mentioned, that it was kept by the patriarchs until the falling of the manna in the wilderness, as recorded in Exod. 16, 23-30, let us now consider a few testimonies of the Church Fathers on this subject. Lutherans do not build their faith and doctrine on human testimony, but solely upon the Word of God. Historical evidence is only of secondary importance and can never assume the place that by right belongs to exegetical and dogmatical proofs drawn from the Holy Scriptures. Papists attempt to prove their errors concerning the mass and their pseudo-sacraments on human traditions; the opponents of infant baptism base their objections on *ex-parte* historical statements. Lutherans base their acceptance of all doctrines not upon history, but upon the Word of God, which interprets itself and must be taken according to the rules of language. But Lutherans do not despise the testimony of history, when it agrees with the only rule of faith and life, the Scriptures of divine inspiration.

Concerning the Sabbath Justin Martyr says in his Dialogue with Trypho (chap. 19), after having shown that Adam, Abel, Enoch, Lot, Noah and Melchizedek did not receive circumcision, as follows: "Moreover, all those righteous men already mentioned, though they kept no Sabbaths, were pleasing God; and after that Abraham with all his descendants until Moses, under whom your nation (the Jews), appeared unrighteous and ungrateful to God, making a calf in the wilderness; wherefore God, accommodating Himself to that nation, enjoined them also to offer sacrifices, as if to His name, in order that you might not serve idols. Which precept, however, you have not observed; nay, you sacrificed your children to demons. And you were commanded to keep Sabbaths that you might retain the memorial of God."

According to this quotation Justin Martyr did not hold that the Sabbath was instituted at the creation, and so far was he from believing that it was observed by the patriarchs

that he denies it. Justin could find neither command nor example in Genesis for keeping the Sabbath, and finds its origin in the wilderness when the Jews were commanded to keep it that they "might retain the memorial of God." Speaking of the new covenant, Justin says: "For if there was no need of circumcision before Abraham, or of the observance of Sabbaths, of feasts and sacrifices, before Moses; no more need is there of them now, after that, according to the will of God, Jesus Christ, the Son of God has been born without sin, of a virgin sprung of the stock of Abraham." (Dialogue with Trypho, chap. 33.)

Speaking of that perfect righteousness that is conferred upon the believer, neither by circumcision, nor by any other legal ceremonies, Irenæus says, "And that man was not justified by these things, but that they were given as a sign to the people, this fact shows,—that Abraham himself, without circumcision and without observance of Sabbaths, believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God. * * * Moreover, all the rest of the multitude of those righteous men who lived before Abraham, and of those patriarchs who preceded Moses, were justified independently of the things above mentioned and without the law of Moses." (Irenæus contra Hæres, cap. 16.)

When Moses called all Israel together to hear the laws and statutes of the Lord, he said to the people, "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day." (Deut. 5, 2. 3.) Irenæus says contra hær. cap. 16): "Why, then, did the Lord not form the covenant for the fathers? Because 'the law was not established for righteous men.' (1 Tim. 1, 9.) But the righteous fathers had the meaning of the Decalogue written in their hearts and souls, that is, they loved the God that made them, and did no injury to their neighbor. There was therefore no occasion that they should be cautioned by prohibitory mandates (correptoriis literis, i. e., the letters of the Decalogue on the two tables of stone), because they had the righeousness of the law in themselves."

Irenæus did not hold that the command concerning

the Sabbath day belonged to the law implanted into the heart of the first man at his creation. Yea, he did not even hold the opinion that it was given to man as a positive ceremonial law before the fall. In his Fifth Book against heresies (chap. 23), he shows that Adam and Eve sinned on the same day they were created, that is, on the sixth day, hence before the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it.

Tertullian in agreement with Justin, Irenæus and many other Fathers of the Church, held that the patriarchs mentioned in Genesis, did not observe the Sabbath day, because not a single example is given in that book from which it might be clearly inferred that that day was kept by the patriarchs. Luther in his comments on Gen. 2, 2. 3. says: "Here Moses is silent concerning man, and does not say that he was commanded to keep the Sabbath." John Gerhard says: "that the Sabbath was unknown to the patriarchs."

The division of time into weeks of seven days among some of the nations of antiquity, is sometimes used as an argument to prove that the seventh day was observed as a sacred day, from the beginning of the world. This mode of reasoning is certainly a *non sequitur*. The antiquity of the week does not prove the keeping of the seventh day or of any other day of the week as a sacred time, devoted to rest and worship. We do not find that the heathen nations of antiquity observed any day as sacred above all others, although many of them divided time into weeks. The Encyclopedia Britannica (vol. 4, article "Calendar,") says of the "week": "It did not enter into the calendar of the Greeks and was not introduced at Rome until after the reign of Theodosius," although "it had been employed from time immemorial in almost all eastern countries." There was nothing sacred in the week as a division of time.

Let us now sum up what has been said. It is evident that Gen. 2, 2. 3. is not a command, but a portion of sacred history. It is equally evident that there is not a single instance, not even a faint allusion, concerning the keeping of the Sabbath in the whole Genesis. And yet in the face of these facts, it is almost universally taught that the Sabbath

command and the observance of the Sabbath day are based on Gen. 2, 2. 3.

II.

Before entering upon the subject before me, I wish to make a few remarks by way of introduction in connection with the preceding part of this article on "The Sabbath in Genesis."

In 1884. Mr. A. E. Waffle, M. A., then professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in Lewisburg University, Lewisburg, Pa., wrote a $1,000 prize essay with the title, "The Lord's Day; Its Universal and Perpetual Obligation." In the sixth chapter Mr. Waffle says: "The nature of this early Sabbath" (Gen. 2, 2. 3.), "is hinted at in the words which record its institution. God *rested* from the work of creation. This is evidently meant to teach men that on the seventh day they are to cease from secular toil, and rest. * * * This idea is more fully developed in the statement that God blessed and sanctified the Seventh day. * * * Sanctifying the day means that God set it apart as a day to be devoted to holy uses. It could have no higher use than to keep man near to his God and to cultivate his moral and religious nature. * * * It is hardly possible to avoid the conclusion that a Sabbath, on which men rested from their secular toil and engaged in the worship of God, was instituted at the beginning of human history."

All Sabbatarians, such as the Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh Day Adventists, as well as all those holding the Puritan view of the "transfer" of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, by virtue of a supposed command of Christ, or of the Apostles, or a law of the Church, agree with Mr. Waffle's views as given above. Both Sabbatarians and Puritans assume that Gen. 2, 2. 3 contains a divine command of universal and perpetual obligation upon all men to keep the Sabbath, and that upon the basis of this command it was kept by the patriarchs before Moses.

From the fact that God rested on the seventh day, Mr. Waffle draws the conclusion that this rest "evidently meant to teach men that on the seventh day they are to cease

from secular toil, and rest," and finds a fuller development of this idea "in the statement that God blessed and sanctified the seventh day." This, however, is not the conclusion made in the Epistle to the Hebrews. There we find that the rest of God on the seventh day was a divine figure or type of the eternal rest of God's people attained through faith, Heb. 4, 1—11. Comp. Rev. 14, 13. This spiritual Sabbath begun on earth in faith, finds its completion in heaven (v. 3, 9).

As there is no express divine command given in Gen. 2, 2. 3 concerning the observance of the Sabbath on the part of man, nor a clear and plain example in Genesis showing that it was kept by the patriarchs, Mr. Waffle can only say that "the nature of this early Sabbath is hinted at in the words which record its institution," and thinks that "it is hardly possible to avoid the conclusion that a Sabbath on which men rested from their secular toil and engaged in the worship of God, was instituted at the beginning of human history." When God instituted matrimony in Eden, the nature of this institution was not "hinted at," but expressed in such plain and simple language, that all can understand, and we cannot say of it that it is "hardly possible to avoid the conclusion" that it was instituted by the Creator "at the beginning of human history," but we must say, that there can be no other conclusion than that it was actually instituted then. The same is also true of our Lord's sacraments, baptism and the holy supper. The nature of these ordinances is not "hinted at" in the Scriptures, but fully expressed in plain and positive terms, and it is utterly impossible to avoid the conclusion that they are divine institutions to be observed by us. Mr. Waffle's conclusion must first be laid into the text before it can be drawn from it. I do not reject logical and legitimate inferences which are deduced from the text of the Scriptures, but say that such faint hints and uncertain allusions, as Mr. Waffle produces, can form no basis for "universal and perpetual obligation" binding the consciences of Christians.

The expressions (Gen. 4, 3), "in process of time," (Heb., "at the end of days,") are said to refer to the seventh

day, the day Cain and Abel brought their offerings unto the Lord. From 1 Kings 17, 7 we learn that "at the end of days" in Hebrew means "after a while," and from Nehem. 13, 6 we learn that "at the end of days" is the same as "after certain days." That Cain and Abel brought their offerings to God "at the end of days," an indefinite period of time, does not prove that they observed the Sabbath. It is more natural to suppose that they brought their offerings at the end of the harvest or of the year.

The reason why I attach so much importance to these passages in Genesis and to the circumstances connected with them, is simply because they are so often employed to prove the "perpetual and universal obligation" resting upon all men, in all times, to keep the Sabbath. I wish to show that this obligation cannot be proven from the book of Genesis, either by direct statements or logical inferences. I know very well that under the New Testament we are free from the ceremonial Sabbath. Therefore I cannot believe that God at creation gave man a Sabbath command of "perpetual and universal obligation." I cannot even find that God gave the first man a command to keep a temporary, ceremonial Sabbath, neither can I find that such a Sabbath was observed by the patriarchs. My purpose is to show that Sabbatarians as well as Puritans are guilty of a *petitio principii*, when they assume that Gen. 2, 2. 3 commands the keeping of the Sabbath.

Let us now turn to the book of Exodus. Here we find the Sabbath first mentioned in the sixteenth chapter. Öhler says in an article on the Sabbath in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia (p. 2,088): "Moses introduced the Sabbath first in connection with the manna (Exod. 16, 5, 22-30) in such a manner as indicated that the Sabbath was as yet unknown to the people." The Israelites had come to the wilderness of Sin between Elim and Sinai. Here they murmured against Moses and Aaron for leading them into this desert, where they expected to perish, and they longed for the flesh-pots of Egypt and the abundance of food in that country. God said to Moses that He would send them bread from heaven, a certain portion of which they should gather every day. It should come to pass that on the sixth day they should gather

twice as much as on the other days. The Lord would test their obedience to His command. Moses and Aaron told the people they would soon know that the Lord had delivered them from the bondage they were under in Egypt, that in the morning they should see the glory of the Lord, who had heard their murmurings, and who would give them flesh in the evening and bread in the morning. In the evening an immense flock of quails covered the whole encampment, and in the morning after the dew had disappeared, they found small round substances, like hoar-frost, covering the ground. They called these little round balls manna (What is this?) They were commanded to gather this manna every day for six days, in proportion to their wants, but to leave none until the next morning. Some of them were disobedient and left a portion over until the next morning, when it became corrupt. On the sixth day they gathered twice as much as on the previous days, according to God's command. When the rulers came and told Moses what the people did, he said: "This is that which the Lord hath said, Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning." The people obeyed as they were commanded, and God miraculously preserved the manna from corruption. Moses told them that that day was a Sabbath, a day of rest unto the Lord on which no manna was to be found in the field. He reproved some for their unbelief and disobedience in going out to gather manna on the Sabbath day. But they found nothing, and God told them that on the sixth day He gave them bread for two days, wherefore they should rest on the seventh day (Exod. 16, 1-30).

Here we have the first command and the first example concerning the keeping of the Sabbath day. There is not the faintest hint or allusion in these passages to any previous command or example concerning the observance of this day in the past. As Öhler says, the Sabbath was introduced "in such a manner as indicated that the Sabbath was as yet unknown to the people." It is supposed by some commentators that the tradition of the Sabbath and its ob-

servance was handed down from generation to generation among the patriarchs, but that when the Israelites were in Egyptian bondage their hard taskmasters would not permit them to observe the Sabbath day, and thus the tradition was lost until it was revived in the wilderness at the falling of the manna. But if this was the case, is it not remarkable that no allusion is made to it in Exodus 16? The whole narrative impresses the impartial reader with the thought that the observance of the Sabbath was something hitherto unknown to the Israelites, that for the first time God gave a plain and positive command, that they should keep the seventh day as a day of holy rest, and that this command was given to the Israelites only. Observe also that whenever God ordained and revealed some new institution, He ratified and confirmed it with miracles. Thus, for instance, the manna kept over from the sixth to the seventh day did not stink, neither was there any worm therein, whilst the manna gathered on other days and kept over night bred worms and stank. And on the seventh day no manna fell as on the other days. God showed by these miracles that He had given the Israelites a new institution, viz., the Sabbath. There is nothing in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus that proves that this Sabbath, the seventh day of the week, was designed to be an institution of perpetual and universal obligation.

We now turn to the twentieth chapter of Exodus. There we read (v. 8-11): "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

In treating of the Ten Commandments, we must always keep in mind that we Christians occupy a different standpoint than did the Israelites. We first make a clear distinction between the moral law, "which contains the precepts of God relating to our moral conduct, which remain un-

changed at all times, and concern all rational creatures," and the ceremonial law, "which contains the ceremonial and civil precepts which were given to the Jews during the period of the Jewish theocracy." (Schmid's Dogmatik on the Law and the Gospel.) This distinction is necessary in order to avoid confusion.

Furthermore, we must also bear in mind, that the Law is spiritual (Rom. 7, 14.), even as Christ shows in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5, 21. 27. 33.), and that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter (Rom. 7, 6). Christians look at the Law from the standpoint of the Gospel. They live and move under the law of liberty (James 1, 25; 2, 12.), for where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty (2 Cor. 3, 17).

The Decalogue contains certain temporal and ceremonial features. Thus when God says, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," (Exod. 20, 2), and again when He says, "Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee," (v. 12), the incidental and temporary features which pertained to the Jews only, may be easily distinguished.

Even so there are incidental, temporary and ceremonial elements in the commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." Under the New Testament dispensation Christians are free with respect to holy days, sabbath days and other times and seasons (Col. 2, 16), which were commanded to be kept under the old dispensation. Christ in His flesh abolished the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances (Eph. 2, 15) and blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross (Col. 2, 14). As for keeping any day for public worship, Christians are at liberty to select any one (Rom. 14, 5. 6). The duty of publicly worshipping God in common, in a congregational capacity, is the very essence of the commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day," to keep it holy, but the observance of any particular time to attend to this duty is not essential. The Israelites indeed were required to observe the seventh day of the week, called the

Sabbath. But this was only a ceremonial element of the Sabbath commandment, and is therefore not binding on Christians. The observance of the seventh day under the old dispensation belonged to "the law of commandments contained in ordinances,"—a part of "the handwriting of ordinances" and "a shadow of good things to come."

The words, "In it (the Sabbath day) thou shalt not do any work" etc., also contain temporary and ceremonial features and elements. The resting of the Israelites on the seventh day and the total cessation from all labor reminded them of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage (Deut. 5, 15),—a circumstance that finds no application to believers under the new dispensation, except as a figure of the believer's rest in heaven. But the proper or literal application of these words pertained to the Jews only.

It is often said that the expression, "Remember the Sabbath day," refers to a command given at the creation of man. Öhler says in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia (Art. Sabbath, p. 2088): "The expression in Exod. 20, 8, 'Remember the Sabbath day,' is not intended to remind of the Sabbath as an ancient institution, but it rather means that the people should always remember the now existing order of the Sabbath." Prof. Jacobs, D.D., says in the Ev. Quarterly Review, Vol. 20, p. 535: "It seems strange that the word *'Remember'*, of the Third Commandment, is so often referred to, as affording decisive proof, that the Sabbath was previously known. It does not require much reflection, to recall instances, in which parents or teachers, in laying down new rules or principles to those in their care, have introduced the declaration, of what has hitherto been unknown, by the word *'Remember'*, in order to declare the special importance of what is thus enjoined." Some commentators are of the opinion, that the expression, "Remember the Sabbath day", refers to the command given in Exodus 16, 22-30, where the first command to keep the seventh day is given. It is evident that the circumstances recorded in that chapter pertained to the Israelites only. When it is said in v. 29, "See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath," the meaning is not that a previous command had been given. If the words that follow ("therefore He giveth

you on the sixth day the bread of two days"), are carefully considered, it will be seen that the Lord spoke of the time when the Israelites gathered the manna. Because He gave them the Sabbath at that time, He therefore gave them on the sixth day the bread of two days. Everything indicates that the Sabbath day was, up to this time unknown to the Israelites. The expression, "the Lord hath given you the Sabbath," does not refer to Gen. 2, 2. 3, but to the time of the falling of the manna.

When it is said in Exodus 20, 11 "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth," etc., it is not intimated that God commanded the first man to keep the seventh day. The 11th verse merely repeats the great fact that *God* rested on the seventh day and sanctified it (Gen. 2, 2. 3), in ceasing from His labors and contemplating on the work He had finished. Luther says in his works (Erlangen Ed. XXXI, p. 443), "When Moses here mentions the seventh day and says that God created the world in six days, wherefore they (the Jews) should perform no labor on the seventh day, this is a temporary ornament" (grace, beauty or decoration) "with which Moses adorns this command at that particular time for his people. For before this time we find nothing of the kind written, either in Abraham's time or in the times of the old fathers. But this is a temporary addition and adornment given to this people that had come out of Egypt, and for them only. But it should not remain perpetually, any more than the whole Mosaical law. However to *sanctify* this day, that is, to teach and preach the Word of God is the true, proper and simple meaning of this command, as it was from the beginning and will always remain for all men."

Under the dispensation of the Gospel we Christians are not bound to observe the seventh day of the week, as the Sabbatarians teach. This is evident from Col. 2, 16. 17; Rom. 14, 5. 6; Gal. 4, 9. 11. That part of the Sabbath commandment, that treats of the particular seventh day and no other, belongs to the ceremonial law, which has only a shadow of good things to come, Heb. 10, 1. Christ has made us free from all the levitical ordinances; He was made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law

(Gal. 4, 4. 5). He has by His obedience not only made us free from the condemnation of the moral law, but also from the ordinances of the ceremonial law.

We now turn to Exodus 31, 12-17, where the observance of the seventh day is again commanded. Here the sabbath is declared to be a sign between God and the children of Israel. They were commanded to "observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant." No labor was to be performed on this day, "for whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death." (See also Exodus 35, 1-3). Here we plainly see that the Sabbath commandment, as given to the Israelites, contains some temporary and ceremonial elements. Concerning the giving of the Sabbath to the Israelites, God said by the prophet: "Moreover, also I gave them my sabbaths to be a sign between me and them" etc. (Ezekiel 20, 12). Dr. Jacobs says in the Ev. Quarterly Review, Vol. 20, p. 535: "Scripture cannot be made to contradict itself. On this subject, as on all others, there is perfect harmony. The analogy of faith points us to the true interpretation, 'I gave them my Sabbath to be a *sign*.' 'It is a sign between me and the *children of Israel*.' 'Let no man judge you, in respect of the sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come.'"

Even so zealous and earnest a Sabbatarian as Dr. A. H. Lewis, says in the Outlook and Sabbath Quarterly (July, 189—), "The entire Decalogue had its 'Jewish setting' and accompaniments. God always reveals truth to men as they are able to receive it, and applies it according to the grade of their spiritual development. Every part of the Decalogue was thus treated." Of course Dr. Lewis is far from admitting that the observance of the particular seventh day is a part of this "Jewish setting" in the Sabbath commandment. But that is what it really is, in spite of Dr. Lewis and all other Sabbatarians. Among the "weak and beggarly elements", which held the Galatian Christians in bondage to the ceremonial law, were "days and months, and times, and years," hence also sabbath days. (Gal. 4, 10). Among the shadow of things to come were not only meats, and drinks, and holy days, and new moons, but also sabbath days (Col. 2, 16. 17).

Among those ordinances that Christ took out of the way, nailing them to His cross, were the sabbath days (14-16). Yes, the Sabbath commandment had its "Jewish setting", as well as every commandment of the Decalogue. This "Jewish setting" was necessary for that time, and God "reveals truth to men as they are able to receive it and applies it to the grade of their spiritual development." Therefore He now says to us, who are living under a new and better dispensation, and who are better able to receive the truth than were the Israelites, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." And when men would lead us back to the bondage of the ceremonial law, God's Word warns us, saying, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." (Gal. 5, 1). "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." (2 Cor. 3, 17).

OUTLINES OF SERMONS ON FREE TEXTS.

BASED ON THE GERMAN OF J. HEINRICH SCHULTZE BY PROF. A. PFLUEGER, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

LUKE 13, 23-29.

THE LORD'S TEAHING CONCERNING THE GATE OF HEAVEN.

He teaches that

I. *The Gate, though strait, is open to all;*

1. The statement of the text, 23. 24;
2. The explanation of the statement;
   a. The gate is straight: it is difficult to be saved,
   b. The gate is open to all: all may be saved if they only will accept the invitation of the Lord.

3. The application;
   a. For comfort: thou art invited to enter,
   b. For admonition: do not let the gate be open in vain for thee.

II. *Though open to all, not many enter it;*
1. The statement of the text, 24;
2. The explanation of the statement;
   a. Many seek to enter in,
   b. But many seek in vain,
3. The application;
   a. Are you striving to enter in?
   b. If not, then begin to strive at once.

III. *At last it will be closed;*
1. The statement of the text, 25-27;
2. The explanation of the statement;
   a. The closing of the gate,
   b. No beseeching will open it,
3. The application;
   a. Do not postpone repentance,
   b. Do not rely upon external advantages.

IV. *It divides the children of God from those who are without;*
1. The statement of the text, 28. 29;
2. The explanation of the statement;
   a. The two kinds of people,
   b. The separation,
3. The application; see to it that ye be not of those who shall be forever thrust out.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MARK 10, 17-25.

RICHES A HINDRANCE TO SALVATION.

Let us

I. *Convince ourselves that this is true;*
We see this
1. From the account in the text,
   a. The rich man makes a good beginning,
   b. But he soon makes a sad retreat;

2. From the impressive declaration of the Lord;
   a. In clear and express terms, 23. 24,
   b. In a proverb, 25.

II. *Inquire whence this comes;*

1. Riches deceive man with reference to the soul's real need of salvation: outward riches conceal one's inward poverty;

2. They render man cold and weak with reference to the calls of salvation;

3. They directly lead man away from the way of salvation, even after he has known it.

III. *Consider the admonition this fact contains;*

1. We are to beware of the sin
   a. Of wanting to become rich,
   b. Of trusting in riches, if they are given us;
2. We are to pray that God may
   a. Draw our hearts away from the desire to become rich,
   b. Make us rich in spiritual blessing and good works.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MATT. 18, 1-11.

TAKE HEED UNTO THE LITTLE ONES.

I. *Why we are to do this;*

1. Because the kingdom of heaven is of such little ones;

2. Because they are our teachers unto the kingdom of heaven; for they remind us
   a. That we are to regard ourselves as frail and helpless,
   b. That we are to be unassuming and humble,
   c. That we are confidently to resign ourselves to the will and calling of God.

II. *How this is to be done;*

1. We are to receive the little ones, 5;
   - *a.* How this is to be understood,
   - *b.* In what way the Lord regards it, 5;
2. We are not to offend them, 6;
   - *a.* What is meant by this,
   - *b.* How punishable such offending is, 6. 7.
   - *c.* How we can avoid offending them, 8. 9.
3. We are not to despise them, 10;
   - *a.* How such despising is done,
   - *b.* Why we are to avoid it.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MATT. 19, 3-9.

DIVORCE IS FORBIDDEN BY THE LORD.

Let us

I. *Hear how the Lord establishes this Prohibition;*

He bases the indissolubility of marriage in the fact that

1. It was so ordained when marriage was first instituted;
   - *a.* God united the first pair indissolubly,
   - *b.* And has declared every subsequent marriage to be of the same character, 5;
2. It is justified by the essence and purpose of marriage;
   - *a.* Marriage is a union of husband and wife, but divorce is the opposite,
   - *b.* The purpose of marriage is to secure man's temporal and eternal welfare, to which divorce is opposed;
3. It never was changed by God in later times, 7. 8;
   - *a.* The legal requirement of a writing of divorcement is no abrogation of the indissolubility of marriage,
   - *b.* But merely a concession to the hardness of the hearts of those who put away their wives,
   - *c.* Only in case of fornication on the part of the husband or wife is the innocent party justified

in applying for a divorce, 9; but such fornication is itself a breaking of the marriage tie.

II. *See how this Prohibition is heeded in Christendom;*

We see that it is honored in a general way, but in particular

1. It is on the one hand directly transgressed,
   a. By divorces secured from the courts,
   b. By separations made in consequence of an agreement between the married parties,
2. On the other hand there is not enough done to prevent the violation of the prohibition; for married people weaken the marriage tie,
   a. By their carelessness,
   b. By their coldness,
   c. By their stubbornness.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

LUKE 19, 1-10.

THE LORD'S BLESSED ENTRANCE INTO THE HOUSE OF ZACCHEUS.

Let us consider

I. *What drew Him thither;*

It was the longing of a human soul for salvation. Notice

1. What does not hinder Zaccheus in this,
   a. Neither his prominent position,
   b. Nor his great wealth,
   c. Nor his high culture.
2. How he makes this known,
   a. By his zeal in trying to see Jesus,
   b. By his disregard of the probable mockery of the multitude on account of his climbing up into the sycamore tree.

II. *How He announced Himself there;*

He announces Himself to Zaccheus, 5,

1. As the Searcher of hearts,
2. As the Friend of souls,
3. As the merciful Redeemer.

III. *What He did there;*

It can be inferred from v. 8 that

1. He spoke of faith in Him as the Lord.
2. He spoke of repentance, which must manifest itself in Zaccheus
   - *a.* By liberality toward the poor,
   - *b.* By his restoring what had been taken unjustly,
   - *c.* By his conscientiously avoiding the sins of which he had been guilty.

IV. *How He took His departure;*

1. With a word of comfort for Zaccheus, who now, v. 9,
   - *a.* Had himself come to a knowledge and an enjoyment of salvation,
   - *b.* Wished to help the members of his household to come to this salvation,
   - *c.* And accordingly was also a son of Abraham.
2. With a word of reproof for the murmuring Pharisees, who
   - *a.* Begrudged Zaccheus the visit of the Savior,
   - *b.* But instead of this should have accepted Christ as their Savior.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MARK 3, 1-8.

HOW CAN WE CELEBRATE THE LORD'S DAY AS THE LORD HIMSELF DID?

The text answers

I. *In the first place: Honor thy God;*

1. The Lord's custom on the Lord's day,
2. Our imitation of Him therein; we must
   - *a.* Come to the house of God,
   - *b.* Hear God's Word,
   - *c.* Praise God's works and ways with prayer and thanksgiving.

II. *In the second place: Help others in their distress;*

1. The Lord's custom.
   a. He helped those who were in bodily distress,
   b. He relieved the distress of the soul.
2. Our imitation of Him therein; we must celebrate the Lord's day
   a. By helping the sick and distressed,
   b. By comforting those who are downcast on account of their sins.

III. *In the third place: Seek the Bread of Life;*

1. The Lord's manner and will as seen
   a. In the tarrying of the disciples,
   b. In the coming together of the multitude.
2. How we are to imitate Him. We must
   a. Take to heart our need of heavenly food,
   b. Let nothing discourage us in our effort to obtain this food,
   c. And comfort ourselves and rejoice in this precious supplying of our wants.

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MARK 6, 14-29.

WHAT STAND DO YOU TAKE WITH REFERENCE TO YOUR CONSCIENCE?

This question reminds us

I. *That not all take the same stand with reference to their conscience;*

1. There are conscientious people, like John the Baptist, who conscientiously did his duty
   a. By means of his prophetic work,
   b. By means of his manly courage in calling on men in high station to repent;
2. There are conscienceless people, like the king's family, which was
   a. Deaf to the voice of conscience,

b. Quenched the movements of the conscience by means of luxury and riotous living,

c. Did violence to the conscience.

II. *That much depends upon the stand which one takes;*

On this depends

1. Whether one in his calling and station is faithful to his duty or not,

2. Whether one is a benefit or an injury to others,

3. Whether one is a blessing or a curse to himself.

III. *That we must be concerned about taking the right stand;*

1. We are to regard the pleadings of conscience as the voice of God;

2. We are always to heed the movements of our conscience,

a. We must not ourselves neglect nor quench them,

b. Nor let them be joked or argued away by others,

c. But vivify and sharpen them by the Word of God;

3. We must always lead a life in accordance with the promptings of our conscience.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MATT. 10, 24-33.

WHEREBY THE CONFESSOR OF CHRIST MAY OVERCOME THE FEAR OF MEN.

I. *By looking to the Example of his Lord and Master.*

1. As his Lord and Master did not keep back the truth of God, although they tried to fill Him with fear;

2. So the disciple and confessor of Christ does not permit the scorn and mockery of the world, with its threats, to keep him from doing the Master's will.

II. *By trusting to the Protection of his heavenly Father;* He is not afraid of men; for

1, He sees that the life and destiny of even an insignificant bird are under the protecting providence of God;

2. How much less will He neglect or forsake the confessors of Christ, and permit them to perish.

III. *By thinking of the Recognition which awaits him from his future Judge;*

1. A most precious reward of grace is here promised and will hereafter be given to the confessors of Christ, but will be denied to those who deny the Lord;

2. By the expectation of this rich reward of the future the confessors of Christ are strengthened and enabled to overcome all fear of men.

THE SEPTUAGINT.

BY PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, Ph. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

For the study of the Old Testament Scriptures the old versions have a relatively much greater value than they have for the new. The oldest Hebrew manuscript extant is the *Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus* of the prophets, dated 916 A. D. The versions, however, all represent an earlier date of the Old Testament text. The Septuagint, restored to its original readings, would antedate by twelve hundred years at least the earliest Hebrew manuscript extant and bring us almost as near to some of the Old Testament autographs as the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus do to the original copies of the New Testament books. The further fact, that in a number of books the Sepuagint text varies from the Massoretic to so marked a degree that the conclusion is almost unavoidable that the translators had before them a recension of the Hebrew text differing from the present Massoretic, opens the way to critical possibilities that are of peculiar interest and importance.

For a further reason the study of the Septuagint is now timely. For the first time in the history of Old Testament research scholars are trying systematically and with trustworthy scientific methods to work out the problems of textual criticism. While in the New Testament field this was the first of the great problems that reached a practical settlement, and in the texts of Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort we have the application of an agreement of methods satisfactory to about all the specialists, and thereby also practically *one* resultant text of the New Testament, in the Old Testament department this problem is only now beginning to be thoroughly discussed, and the burning question is yet in regard to the methods and principles that must control this investigation. The great work done in the Old Testament line in the past decade and century has been in the line of higher criticism. But in the further prosecution of this work, scholars are constantly hampered by the fact that the problems of lower criticism have not yet been settled. New Testament scholarship in this regard followed the more logical order of research, but its task was easier.

ORIGIN OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

Concerning the origin of the Septuagint as a whole we have absolutely no external historical testimony whatever. All we possess is testimony of a debatable character concerning the translation made of the Pentateuch. There exists a letter, beyond all doubt spurious, which claims to have been written by Aristeas (or Aristæas, as Josephus calls him), a man high in authority at the court of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus (283-247 B. C.), addressed to his brother Philocrates. This letter states that Demetrius Phalereus, the chief librarian at Alexandria, proposes to King Ptolemy to enrich his library by having a translation of the Jewish law-book made for it. The king agrees to this, and sends an embassy consisting of his chief of guards, Andrew, and Aristeas, the author of the letter, to Jerusalem with rich presents to the high priest Eleazar, asking him to send old and worthy and wise men, six out of each tribe, to Alexandria, where they were to translate the law-book for the

royal library. Eleazar sends the seventy-two men, who take with them a precious manuscript of the Pentateuch written in golden letters. After having been royally entertained by the king, Demetrius conducts them to the island of Pharus, where they could work undisturbed. When they had come to an agreement on a section, Demetrius wrote down the version. The whole work was completed in seventy-two days. A copy of the translation was given to the Jewish community at Alexandria, who officially and solemnly adopted it. The letter of Aristeas is very long and goes minutely into details in describing the visit to Jerusalem and the colloquy held with King Ptolemy. It was first printed in 1601, and the best edition is found in Merx, *Archiv.*, 1868.

What is the value of this Aristeas letter? Its character is such that, without a dissenting voice, scholars are agreed that it is apocryphal and valueless as direct historical testimony. The majority agree that it contains a kernel of historical truth, but what the extent of this truth is, does not seem so clear. Wellhausen, in Bleek (§ 279) and in his article on the Septuagint, in Vol. XXI. of the Encyclopedia Britannica, regards it as settled by the letter that the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch was done at Alexandria during the reign of Ptolemy II. All the rest of the letter he regards as literary decoration and ornamentation. Schürer, in his *Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ*, Second Part, § 33, regards this as merely a possibility, but by no means certain. For the details of the discussion we refer to the authors mentioned. So much, however, is certain, that the Aristeas account at an early day found acceptance among the Jews. Philo knows of it in detail, and Josephus reproduces it almost in full as an historical fact.

A second direct testimony is from Aristobulus, of Alexandria, the oldest Jewish philosopher, who wrote a work on the Interpretation of the Sacred Laws, which he dedicated to King Ptolemy Philometer (180-145 B. C.), of which an extract has been preserved by the church historian Eusebius (*Praeparatio Evangelica*, XIII., 12, 1, 2). Here Aristobulus maintains that Plato already was acquainted with the law-book of the Jews, and that the chief contents

of the book had been translated into Greek even before the days of Demetrius Phalereus. From this it would seem that the author knew of a tradition about the Greek version of the Pentateuch differing to a degree from that given by Aristeas. But whether this vague statement confirms the accounts of Aristeas or makes it historically still more unreliable, it would be difficult to say. The individual view in the matter depends upon the amount of probability to be given to the Aristeas letter.

Concerning the translation of the other books in the Septuagint we have absolutely no historical record whatever. The name of a "Version of the Seventy," an abbreviation for seventy-two, was gradually transferred from the Pentateuch to the whole work.

But if we have no direct testimony as to the *terminus a quo* we are more fortunate in having some of reasonable reliance for the *terminus ad quem* of the version. In the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, the translator, who in 132 B. C. went to Egypt, remarks that in his day there existed Greek versions, not only of the law, but also of the prophets and the other books. There can be little or no doubt that he here refers to the Septuagint version, which, at that date, must have been completed. This is corroborated by the further fact that the most ancient relics of Jewish literature, preserved in extracts by Alexander Polyhistor, and recorded by Eusebius in his *Praep. Evang.*, IX., all show acquaintance with the Septuagint (cf. for details, Schürer, l. c., § 33).

It is then almost entirely internal evidence to which we must appeal for information concerning the origin of this historic version. It will appear later on that diversities in the manner of translation in the various parts are so great, that the idea of one man or one set of men having made this version is entirely excluded. Beyond a doubt a beginning was made with the law, which, as also is seen from internal reasons, originated in Alexandria, and was known to Demetrius, who wrote under Ptolemy IV. (222-205 B. C.). Whether the translation of the law is to be attributed to the Jewish influence or to the literary ambition of the Ptolemies, is a much discussed question, for which only a possibly, scarcely a probably, correct answer can be given. That the

other books were translated under Jewish auspices is highly probable, as they could not possess literary importance sufficiently to tempt a Greek translator. The work of translating the whole Hebrew codex into Greek may have occupied a generation or two, or even a whole century. External and internal evidences will scarcely admit of going further than has been done in the above remarks.

THE CHARACTER OF THE TRANSLATION.

The first thing that strikes the student when comparing the Septuagint text with the Hebrew is the differences of agreement and disagreement existing between the Greek and the original texts in the different books. Some agree almost word for word; as is the case especially with the Pentateuch and in a smaller measure with several of the hagiographa, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, and Chronicles. Others, again, vary exceedingly, the worst in this regard being, in the view of most scholars, the Book of Isaiah. Unfortunately special investigations of all the books have not yet been made, so as to allow a judgment on the whole. Lagarde has examined the Book of Proverbs; Bickell, that of Job; Hollenberg, that of Joshua; Wellhausen, the text of Samuel; and within the past few years exhaustive investigations of the text of Ezekiel and of Micah have been made, though from different stand-points and diverging results on the merits of the Septuagint, the former by Cornill, the latter by Ryssel. The differences between the Greek and Hebrew are often many and of much greater importance than the great bulk of various readings in the New Testament manuscripts. In a large number of instances the Greek contains matter not found in the Hebrew, as, e. g., in the Books of Ezra and Daniel, and to a lesser degree in such Books as Job and Proverbs. In other cases matter found in the Hebrew is omitted or abridged in the Greek. In many cases the Greek is an incorrect translation of the present Hebrew text, the cause of the false rendition being still traceable to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew. This is particularly the case in the more difficult poetical and prophetic books. The present writer

recently compared word for word the Greek text of the Proverbs with the original. Not only were there many omissions found, but on the average only about one sentence in three was what could be regarded as a good translation, although in many instances the source of the poor rendering could yet be discovered.

The language of the Septuagint is most remarkable. It is almost incorrect to say that it is Greek. Plato and Aristotle would have been able to understand but little of the non-historical portions. The Greek is entirely under the spell of the Hebrew. The Septuagint has a language of its own. Naturally the difficulties are not in the grammatical line; they are almost entirely in the lexical. A Greek word which in one of its uses corresponds to a Hebrew word in one of its uses, is at once made the equivalent of the latter in all its figurative applications; and even more than this, also in its employment for clauses, phrases, and peculiar idioms. Because, e. g., the Greek δίδωμι in its basal sense is the equivalent of the Hebrew n a t h a n, it is at once compelled to do service in every sense and every connection in which the latter can be employed. And when it comes to the use of Old Testament words of peculiar theological or ethical importance, such as δόξα, εἰρήνη, and others, they are used in senses of which the classical Greek lexicon knows absolutely nothing. It is for this reason that even so good a Greek dictionary as "Liddell and Scott" is useless for Septuagint work. A Septuagint lexicon is a great desideratum, which, however, can scarcely be filled until the Septuagint text itself has been better settled. As yet a good Hebrew dictionary and an accurate knowledge of Greek are indispensable requisites for close Septuagint work.

But the very awkwardness in the language, which robs it of nearly all its value as a piece of literature, is of the greatest advantage for the very work for which Christian scholarship desires to use the Septuagint, namely, to determine the character of the Hebrew text of which the Septuagint is a translation. As matters now stand it is as a rule no difficult matter to re-translate the Greek and thus reconstruct the Hebrew original. Its very faults make it a valu-

able aid for text-critical work. Were the translation less slavish and less barbarized with Hebraisms, this could not be the case.

HISTORY OF THE TRANSLATION.

The so-called translation of the Seventy rapidly wo. its way into official recognition among the Hellenistic Jews. The oldest writers of whom we have any knowledge that they used the LXX. are Demetrius and Eupolemus. After them we find Philo using the translation, at least of the Pentateuch, as equally authoritative with the original. The same is done, though not to the same degree, by Josephus. The majority of the New Testament writers make use of the Septuagint translation, especially Mark and Paul. Indeed the whole lexical material of the New Testament is based upon the *usus loquendi* of the LXX. In this regard the method pursued by Cremer in his *New Testament Lexicon* is more correct than that of Trench in his *Synonyms*, who develops the New Testament words out of the classical Greek in a rather one-sided manner. The use and honor of the LXX. in the Christian Church, as well as the perception that it was not in every particular a true version, led to the preparation of the three well-known later Greek versions, namely, the intensely literal one of Aquila, that of Theodotion, in which he tries to compromise between the Hebrew text and the current LXX. version, and that of Symmachus, the Ebionite, which adheres to the Hebrew original but translates into readable Greek. Fragments of these versions are preserved in the Hexapla. In the ordinary Septuagint editions Theodotion's translation of Daniel has been substituted for the old version. No one of the existing MSS. contains the old "common" or original text of the LXX., although scholars are substantially agreed that we have a near approach to it in B, or the Vaticanus. Cornill's investigations have made this more probable than it was before. But we have the testimony of patristic literature that at a relatively early date the discrepancies between the old LXX. and the *veritas Hebraica*, as Jerome and others call it, led to a revision of the text. Of these revisions there were three. The first and most important was made by

Origen (185-254 A. D.) in his Hexapla. He made the common text the basis of his investigations, and corrected the text chiefly after the Greek translations made later from the Hebrew, especially Theodotion's. He designated the *plus* and *minus* of the edition by critical marks. The value of this edition is reduced to a minimum by the fact that Origen seems not to have been consistent in his methods, as is seen chiefly from the Syriac Hexapla. The Origen text was published by Eusebius and Pamphilus of Cæsarea, and became the official text of Palestine. The revision of Hesychius was accepted by the church of Egypt and that of Lucianus by the churches of Constantinople and Antioch. The Patristic citations on these points are found in full in Wellhausen's Bleek (§§ 282, 283).

In this way the old LXX. text in its original character was lost and supplanted by revisions made avowedly to conform the Greek to the accepted Hebrew text of the day. The great work then to be done by Septuagint scholars is to discover again, if possible, the original "common" text and thus learn what the real Septuagint was. It is a work of extraordinary difficulty to investigate the manuscripts of the version and, if possible, classify them in such a manner as to lead to the solution of this problem. A beginning, and a good one, has been made by Lagarde, who has begun the publication of what he considers the Lucianus recensions, and further work in this line has been done by Cornill's classification.

THE VALUE OF THE VERSION.

A partial answer to this has already been given in the above, and a full answer, in so far as this can be given at all at this stage of inquiry, will flow naturally from what has been stated. While the exegetical value, especially for individual passages, cannot be estimated at too high a rate, the chief advantage to the Bible student must and always will lie in the text-critical help afforded by the LXX. Until the original text of the LXX. has been re-discovered in so far as this can ever be done, and thus the critical status of the version *as such* been determined, the use of the Greek for the Hebrew text or interpretation must be decided in each

individual instance on the merits of the case in question. No general rule for the use of the LXX. in this regard can yet be given. Such a rule would infallibly lead to a misuse, as it has where rash attempts at generalization have been made.

EDITIONS OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

The editions of the Septuagint are many. The best known and most used is the so-called Sixtina, of 1587. This is the traditional text. Fortunately it is also a comparatively good one, being based in general upon the best MS. of the LXX. extant, namely, the Vaticanus. Tischendorf has also published an edition, which was, however, only a slight improvement on the Sixtina. This was still the case when in Nestle's edition of Tischendorf some variant readings of the other uncials were appended. The magnificent facsimile reproduction of the Vaticanus, published in Rome 1868-1881, prepared the way for a really good edition of the text. This Prof. Swete has published in four volumes. Here the genuine Vaticanus text, which deviates considerably from the Sixtina, is reproduced, together with such readings from the other leading MSS. as to give the reader the best critical material on hand for the study of the Septuagint version. No other edition should now be used for Septuagint work.

THE HERMIT CHRISTIAN NATION OF AFRICA.

BY PROF. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, Ph. D., COLUMBUS. OHIO.

None have a better reason for feeling a special interest in the Abyssinians than the Christians of all lands. In reality these are the hermit Christian nation of the globe, the oldest national Christian Church in existence. Organized as early as the fourth Christian century and adopting the tenets and teachings of the Greek Church of that age, the Church of Abyssinia has retained to the present day, although in the form of petrified formalism, the doctrines, liturgies, the services and all external forms of the age which witnessed the

conversion of this unique people. Ever since the conquest of Egypt by the Moslems the Abyssinians have been separated from the Church at large; in fact the rupture between it and the Greek Church and the Abyssinian began when the Synod of Chalcedon in 451 condemned the Monophysitic tenets of the Egyptian and other churches. With the exception of a passing acquaintance with the Portuguese in the fifteenth century, which led among other things to the attempt to force Abyssinia to an acceptance of the pope and the Roman Catholic System by the machinations of the Jesuits, Abyssinian Christianity has been an unknown quantity to Western Chrisianity for a dozen and more centuries and is even yet to a great extent an enigma, as neither the Roman Catholic nor the Protestant missionaries have succeeded in bringing them into touch and line with Western Christianity.

The sad experiences of the Italians in Abyssinia in the last decade have naturally led to the inquiry as to what manner of men these people are. The Abyssinian or Ethiopian is not black; he is a Semite, the brother of the Hebrew, the Arab and the Syrian. He is a Caucasian pure and unadulterated. His physiology, his language, his method of thought clearly indicate this. His color is, indeed, to use the word of an old missionary, "coffee colored", but this has manifestly been the result of climatic influences. Between his language and that of the other Semitic peoples, such as the Arabs and Hebrews, there is as close a relationship as that which exists on the one hand between the French, Spanish, Portuguese and Italian, and on the other hand between the German and the Scandinavian tongues.

Nobody is better aware of his noble descent than the Abyssinian. The tradition of the country goes back to the days of King Solomon and even earlier. The royal house of the land, as also the present King Menelik, claim descent from the wise King of Israel. The Queen of Sheba, of whom we have a record in the Scriptures, they claim for themselves, as also that she bore Solomon a son, called Menelik, who, after receiving his education in Jerusalem under his great father's direction, returned to rule the Abyssinians. The native chronicles, of which there are many, as can be seen by glancing at the monumental work of Ludolf,

"*Historia Aethiopica*", where they are reproduced, trace the present house up to that day, member by member, making the ruling family of Abyssinia as far as age is concerned the rival of the houses of Japan and China. Tradition also claims that this Menelik brought back from Jerusalem twelve priests and that he stole the original Ark of the Covenant out of the temple at Jerusalem and took it to his own capital city, Axum, the ruins of which are yet in existence. In this tradition there is evidently at least a mixture of truth. Although the Abyssinians are Christians, yet in their faith and church life they have many Jewish elements. Thus they still practice circumcision as well as baptism, observe the seventh day of the week as well as the first have many fast days, and the like. It seems highly probable that they were converts to the Jewish faith before they became Christians. The existence in their midst of a peculiar people called "Falashas", or Black Jews, with a Jewish type of faith representing the ante-Christian period corroborates this surmise. The Abyssinians have also a record of a Jewish dynasty that ruled over the country for a number of decades, before it could be overthrown by the Christians. The serfdom of the Falashas is usually attributed to the development of that period.

The modern world has learned to know the Abyssinians chiefly as a fighting people. To this distinction they have an historic right. The Italians are not the first to receive stunning surprises in this direction. The Abyssinian people and their church constitute a Christian oasis in a vast Mohammedan desert, and this has been the state of affairs for more than one thousand years. The Moslem propaganda of the sword and fire was able to overthrow almost the entire Christian East and its doings in Armenia to-day is a fair sample of the manners and methods it has adopted at all times to attain its ends. The green standard of the phophet of Mecca was carried in triumph over all Northern Africa, crossed over into Europe at both Gibralter and at the Bosporus, pressed forward in the West almost to the Rhine and in the East to the very gates of Vienna, yet this same power was not able to conquer the mountain fastnesses of Abyssinia or supplant the cross by the crescent in a people geographically nearest to Mecca, the heart of the Islam body of peo-

ples, although the Abyssinians probably have never numbered more than four millions of people, possibly not even that many. For about twelve hundred years the attempt has been made in countless ways and manners by the Mohammedan neighbors to destroy the Christian civilization of Abyssinia, but without success. In the struggle for existence the Abyssinians have against all these fearful odds managed to maintain their national existence and their land. From the first conquest of Egypt by the Moslems down to the last attack of the Madhi on King John of Abyssinia some few years ago there has been a life and death struggle between the Christian and his historic enemy in the East for the possession of "the Switzerland of Africa", and the Moslem has never won. For a dozen centuries the Abyssinians have had the best of opportunities to learn how to fight, and their handling of the Italians shows that they have learned their lesson.

It is true that the civilization of Abyssinia is not much to boast of. It came into contact with Christianity and the civilized world in the fourth century and at once adopted the Christian civilization of the Greeks. This it has retained to the present day, although in a petrified formalistic shape. In fact the thought and life of Abyssinia to-day is the petrifaction of Greek Christian thought and life more than a thousand years ago. In dogma, liturgy, services, etc., we have this petrifaction. Yet in spite of all this the Abyssinians have retained many noble traits of character, which could not be otherwise in a people so highly gifted and of such noble descent. As a sample we quote the words of the great Swiss traveller Munzinger, who spent many years in Abyssinia. He says:

"Even if the Abyssinians are great fighters and constantly engaged in war, yet the soldiers spare the women and the children. No free Abyssinian citizen is ever sold into slavery by his fellow citizens. Serfdom exists only in the case of blacks brought from abroad, and these constitute the smallest portion of the population. To engage in the slave trade is punished by death. The woman is sacred to the Abyssinians, and has her own rights, and these are great, such as the right of inheritance, etc."

Many of the customs and habits of the modern Abyssinian recall the times of the Judges in Israel. The primitive and patriarchal system of society seems like a relic of earliest Semitic antiquity. Their literature is quite extensive, but all Christian in character, and almost consisting exclusively of traditions, chiefly from the Greek, the Arabic and the Coptic. Hundreds of Ethiopic Manuscripts are found in European libraries, especially in London. The language and literature well repays a careful study.

NOTES.

In the *Christliche Welt*, of Leipzig, No. 5, Professor Hermann Schmidt, who has published several works on the Parables of Christ, groups the Parables of Christ from the standpoint of their theological, or rather christological contents, in a manner that is suggestive and at the same time instructive in demonstrating their rich theological teachings. Under the general head of "The Kingdom of God," as the central theme of all the Parables, he divides these as follows:

First Book, or the King of this Kingdom.

I. His Work, viz., the salvation of the sinner. 1) The seeking and saving love in the picture of the shepherd and the woman in Luke 15, 1-10; 2) the forgiving love in the picture of the magnanimous father, Luke 15, 11-32; *a)* the double error in the picture of the prodigal son and his envious brother; *b)* the double way of justification in the picture of the publican and the pharisee, Luke 18, 3-14; *c)* the new life of thanksgiving for the righteousness from faith in the picture of the woman who was a sinner, the continuance in death unless sin is recognized and unappreciated charity of judgment as seen in the picture of the smaller debtor, Luke 7, 36-50. 3) The long-patient and interceding love in the picture of the vinedresser, Luke 13, 6-9; 4) the all-enduring love in the picture of the man who gave the great supper, Luke 14, 16-24; cf. the merciful love in the picture of the good Samaritan.

II. His Work, viz., the only and beloved Son of God

in the picture of the heir slain by the vineyardmen, Matth. 21, 33-46.

Second Book, of the Coming of the Kingdom. Preparation for and reception of the glad tidings concerning the King and His Kingdom.

I. The Rules for the proclamation of this good tidings. 1) Begins on a small scale and in secret, in the picture of the mustard seed, Matth. 13, 31. 32; 2) later thoroughly and diligently, in the parable of the leaven, Matth, 13, 33; 3) cast aside worrysome cares and avoid impatience, Mark 4, 26-29; 4) be sober in the work, in the parable of the tower and the king, Luke 14, 25-33; 5) do not anticipate the judgment of God, in the parable of the tares in the wheat and the fish in the net, Matth, 13, 24-30; 47-50.

II. The Reception of these good tidings. 1) Unwillingness, coldness and open hostility toward the message and gross abuse of it, in the parable of the royal feast, Matth. 22, 1-14; cf. on the unwillingness, Luke 14, 12-24, the parable of the great supper, cf. on the hostility, Matth. 21, 33-46, the parable of the wicked vineyardmen; 2) insufficient reception or the hindrances to its reception in the parable of the sower and the seed, Matth. 13, 1-23; 3) full and entire reception in the parable of the treasure and the pearl, Matth. 13, 44-46.

Third Book, or the Citizens of the Kingdom.

I. In their relation to the world, or mission zeal and fidelity in using the entrusted Gospel, in Matth. 25, 14-30 (cf. Luke 14, 25-33). Mercy and the right use of earthly possessions, Luke 10, 25-37 and Luke 16, 13-31; Luke 16, 1-13 and 12, 13-21.

II. In their relation to their brethren, or Reconciliation and fraternal affection in Matth. 18, 21-25; Unselfishness in Matth. 20, 1-16.

III. In their relation to God and to Christ, or deep gratitude and complete submission, Luke 7, 36-50; untiring zeal in prayer and intercession, Luke 11, 5-13, and 18, 1-8; growth in the consciousness of sin and in humility, Luke 18, 9-14; anxiety for complete union with the Lord and hence constant readiness for His day, in Matth. 25, 1-13.

—Of the new and magnificent catalogue of the Library of the Jerusalem Patriarchate, published in Greek by the Russian Palestine Society and compiled by the well-known scholar, Papadoponlos, the first volume of which has been mentioned in these columns, the second volume has now appeared. On 662 pages descriptions are given of 703 works, nearly all in manuscript form. Of these only one goes back to the eighth century, viz., three pages from Chrysostom. To the ninth century belong ten undated and one dated manuscript; to the 9-10 centuries four MSS.; to the tenth, twenty-seven undated and two dated MSS.; to the 10-11 centuries, seventy undated and three dated MSS.; to the 11-12 centuries, 10; to the 12th century thirty-four undated and one dated MSS.; to the 12-13 centuries, three MSS.; to the 13th century, forty-five undated and four dated MSS.; to the 13-14 centuries, eight MSS.; to the 15th century, forty-eight undated and eighteen dated; to the 16th century, ninety undated and forty-five dated MSS.; to the 17th and 18th centuries, 162 undated and 133 dated MSS.; to the 19th century, six undated and twenty dated MSS. Of MSS. with miniatures of all kinds there are 115. This collection, which constitutes the old library of the Saba cloister, since 1887 a part of the Jerusalem library, thus contains a larger percentage of older codices than is ordinarily the case in oriental collections. The library is, however, only a remnant of what it formerly was, as this is really the case with the most of the Eastern libraries. As to the contents of the MSS., it can be stated that the bulk of the works are of an ecclesiastico-liturgical character. In addition there are Lectionaries, Euchologies, Minæans, Anthologies, Synoxaria and the like, together 330 works. Of the Old Testament the Psalter is found oftenest, viz., 32 times. Of the New Testament the four Gospels are found nineteen times; Acts and the Epistles eleven times.

—How many letters did Paul write to the Corinthians —two, or three or even four? All three views have had their defenders in our day, some claiming that a first letter written earlier than the first of the two in the New Testament canon has been lost and others claiming that a letter between these

two has been lost. The whole question is discussed in a very satisfactory manner in the *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschrift*, No. 12, by Consistory Councillor Kühn and a vigorous defense is made of the traditional view that there were but two letters written and these the two we have in our New Testament collection. The writer, closely following the footsteps of Zahn in his researches, emphasizes the fact that the apostolic authorship of a book was the condition of its acceptance by the congregations, and demonstrates the inherent improbability amounting practically almost to an impossibility, that a letter sent officially by an apostle to a congregation should have been lost. An examination of the passages in question shows that this antecedent probability is correct. 1 Cor. 5, 9-10, which is generally cited to prove an earlier letter lost can be made to do so only by misinterpretation. In v. 9 the apostle Paul gives an injunction which could possibly be extended too far in its application, and this is prevented by the addition of v. 10. In the epistolary style of the ancients he adds ἔγραψα instead of γραφω. The reference is thus not to another but to the present letter, which is the true significance also of the article before the word "letter." It is also incorrect to imagine that the apostle Paul made a journey or wrote a letter to the Corinthians between the first and the second letters. He indeed 2 Cor. 12, 14 shows that he indeed three times had intended to go to Corinth but managed to get there only twice. The passage urged in favor of a lost letter between the two Canonical Epistles is 2 Cor. 2, 3, but here the word "wrote" fairly interpreted means nothing but which it did in the verse cited above, the reference being to the second letter now in the hands of the Corinthians. It is true that the second Epistle shows a different state of affairs in Corinth from that presupposed by the first; but we know that Paul had sent as his representative his pupil Timothy, and it was from him that he learned of this difference and accordingly prepared his second letter from a different point of view. A letter between our two is not at all necessary to explain the difference between the historical background of the two canonical epistles. Kühn makes good use of his arguments for both isagogical and exegetical purposes in connection with the two Corinthian letters.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. XVI. AUGUST, 1896. No. 4.

SHOULD OUR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES BE CONSOLIDATED?

BY REV. CONRAD B. GOHDES, A. M., NEW [illegible] NS, LA.

Our beloved Lutheran Church is and always has been the guardian of education. While Rome thrives best upon the soil of ignorance and encourages popular education only when constrained by opposition, the Lutheran Church has always invited the freest inquiry. Popular ignorance flees, as if by magic, where the Church of the Reformation plants her banners. Nor does the Lutheran Church limit her educational zeal to the province of theology. Her aim has always been to turn the search-light of investigation upon the whole vast sea of truth; to maintain the essential oneness of all truth as the emanation from the mind of the Eternal; to teach all branches of knowledge as interdependent, and to apply to all science, to all results of human thought the test of God's Word. Thus she has, wherever true to her ideals, in all generations, led both mind and heart to God. It appears to be the genius of the Lutheran Church, to take in hand education in all its branches and grades. The Ely plan, according to which the various denominations are to erect halls near the campus of the State University, with no more teachers, than are requisite to complement the teaching given by the state, may have many commendable features, notably of an economical character, but it will never become popular in the Church of the Reformation.

Only lack of unity has prevented our church from establishing a university after the type of those in the fatherland.

Cooperation of the vast host of Lutherans upon these shores appearing, for the time being, impossible, our educational system is far from being complete. No Lutheran School gives a University course in any science, excepting theology. Our prospective lawyers, physicians, philosophers are educated not by the Church, but generally by the State. Our colleges are unable to offer, in scientific equipment, such facilities, as the State University and some favored private institutions. This is one and probably the chief reason, why our Lutheran colleges attract to themselves, with few exceptions, only representatives from their own constituency. With more gratification we turn to that feature of our educational system which is essential to the well-being of the Church, our theological seminaries.

But even here, and I speak now especially of our synod, satisfactory conditions do not prevail. We have breadth, but lack uniform depth. We have three seminaries, but none, as it appears to me, embodying those features of efficiency which the Church, in the present stage of her development, has a right to demand. No captious spirit dictates this article. As growth when ended, will invariably result in decay, so there can not with safety be a "Let well enough alone" with our educational institutions which determine the welfare of the whole synod and the strength and efficiency of our ministry. It is desirable, that all important measures and changes should not be inaugurated until after a full and objective discussion in our synodical press. In this respect our synod has not been free from mistakes in the past. It is easy for brethren whose zeal and godliness are above suspicion, to arouse by glowing description and burning pleas sympathy for a favorite scheme involving great outlay and a change of previous principle, but when the new scheme is tested in the light of experience, it is seen not infrequently, that enthusiasm and not wisdom has dictated the policy. Full and frank discussion should precede the adoption of all important measures, and when the brethren understand each other, when the measure has been examined from every possible perspective, our officials can take intelligent action. Action being taken,

the very principles of Christian liberty demand a general merging of views and hearty cooperation. The writer doubts, whether a difference of opinion exists upon the desirability of making the training given by our theological seminaries more efficient. Differences can exist only as to methods. I, for one, am convinced, that a consolidation of our theological seminaries would produce many and decided advantages.

I) The central institution of our synod is undoubtedly our theological seminary. From the graduates of this class the ranks of our future professors, editors, leaders of thought and action will generally be recruited. Accordingly the most important position in the gift of the Church is a professorship in that seminary. This is true not only, because the equipment of our theological youth with useful and necessary knowledge and the moulding of their professional character is entrusted to our professors. The province of their influence is wider. Their influence should be felt beyond the college walls. It should be felt by every minister; it should be felt beyond the confines of our synod and church. Not increased authority is meant, but increased facility of giving the church at large the benefit of their larger gifts and opportunities. They should supply a channel between ourselves and the larger church, directing streams of wholesome influence into our midst, upholding the principles, for which we stand, for the emulation, and perhaps the rebuke of others. It is a puny conception of the office of a professor, that his whole duty consists in the rehearsing with his pupils of the lessons assigned, and preparation for the same. Our professors should have time for original research. An eminent educational writer gave as definition of the University spirit: the willingness to pay a professor five thousand dollars a year for teaching three students three lessons a week. The financial feature of this definition we may leave out of consideration. Our professors have scorned to accept lucrative positions in secular institutions, preferring to consecrate their talents to the kingdom of God. But this much they have a right to expect of the church, to be given an opportunity to do their work in that broader manner which alone renders it truly effective. Our Church in this country has been given a

great task. In Europe the spirit of rationalism and irreverence is potent in academy and pulpit. Destructive influences are abroad in our land, also. These destructive agencies must be opposed by constructive forces. Of our doctors it is expected to marshal these forces, to give general information concerning the condition of the battlefield and the needs and exigencies of the hour. Our professors are not only expected to know the great historical movements of the past, discernible in the strata of church history, like geological periods in the strata of rock. They are to watch and understand also the movements of the present, in order to direct intelligently and wisely the body whose leaders they are. While on the one hand they should know, what dangers threaten the peace of Zion either from outspoken foeman, or from treacherous friend, they should on the other hand have opportunity to survey and aid the work which the friends of Jesus are doing. New light is constantly shed upon old truth, new links are forged constantly which bind fragments into systems. It is for our doctors especially, to be abreast of the time, to be in touch with the host of the truth everywhere, so that the facts in their possession, well ordered and arranged, can become the property of their followers and pupils.

Accepting this broad conception of the professorial office as demanded by the exigencies of the hour, does it not strike us, that we have almost sinned against those worthy men who have done so much for us and the church? There was a time when our venerable Dr. Loy was not alone the president of the synod and of Capital University, but also editor of this magazine and of the Lutheran Standard. Did we not compel our worthy leader by putting all that work upon him, to draw sustenance for his mental life from the past rather than the present? How could he find time, without endangering his health, for original research, for replenishing that reserve force of knowledge which makes teaching a delight for the teacher as well as the pupil? Judging from this standpoint, it is, no doubt, unwise, to shoulder the editorship of our German paper upon another professor in spite of his well known capacity for work. The latter work could and should be done by some one else, in order to enable Professor Stellhorn to devote his talents,

for which we all have reason to thank God, to the higher work of his professorship.

Although there appears to be a growing inclination to divest the professorial office from all those tasks which are foreign to its purpose, there is another evil in existence which threatens to remain unabated for some time to come. I mean the combination of professorships whereby a professor is constrained to teach college branches alongside of theology. I am glad, that one wiser and more experienced than myself, the venerable Dr. Loy, has given public expression to his views upon this subject. If we want to make our seminary more efficient, we should bend all our energies toward the speedy abolition of this anomalous condition. Our professor of systematic theology taught also Mathematics. Our venerable dean teaches besides his important theological branches also Psychology, Discourse and Logic. How can our worthy professors under these circumstances be equal to their tasks? Where is there time and strength for such specific scientific work as their predilections and endowments suggest? It is clear: one side of their work must suffer. If the scientific instinct is more strongly developed in the professor, his classes must suffer in proportion as he surrenders to his desire for independent investigation and study. If he is first of all a teacher, he will neglect the scientific work, for which his gifts qualify him. Thus the instructor's influence upon the church at large and his pupils will be curtailed and the Church will be the loser. It goes without saying that, as a rule, a teacher can not well divide his sympathy between theological and collegiate branches. He can not ordinarily maintain depth, mental vigor, enthusiasm. We can not expect our professors, to efficiently discharge the duties of leadership, if one half of their time is to be given to work of a subordinate character.

How can our professors best discharge the functions of their larger office? By the production of literature. American Lutheran literature is, at present, in practically an inchoate state. We may, indeed, claim the literary productions of the fatherland as ours, but the time is speedily coming, when those Latin and German treasures will be open only to the learned. Moreover a distinctly American literature is needed, because the conditions of our Church

in this land are distinct from those elsewhere. . Mere translations and adaptations from the German and Latin will not suffice. The foreign cereal sown upon our soil will acquire a distinct flavor, the fruit-tree domesticated here will produce fruit modified by the conditions of our soil and climate. In harmony with these analogies we should not merely appropriate, we should create. We have a right to the productions of other lands and ages, but should turn the strength, thus gained, into channels of thought distinctly our own. The doctrines and principles which we hold dear, should not deviate an hair's breadth from those held by our fathers, but the form and flow of our literature should be directed by existing conditions. In this process of adjustment and adaptation through the medium of literature, who is so well qualified to take the lead as our professors? It is an object of rejoicing that Lutheran professors and pastors of all synods are coming into prominence in the arena of literature, that the names of our doctors are not infrequently found in periodicals devoted to science and philosophy as well as theology. It is surprising, that our worthy men have found time under the stress of manifold duties, to write books of such sterling value as have left our press. But how much more could have been done by our leaders, if their hands had been left free, to devote themselves exclusively to the production of literature, besides the duties of their professorship. It is an object of intense regret to the writer, that our worthy dean, endowed by God with extraordinary talents, animated by extraordinary devotion, has been hampered throughout the length of his career by duties which others could have borne. Now, that the days of his virile strength and literary productiveness are passed, and he is yearning for the rest which God has promised His people, we may regretfully consider, how much richer our synod and church would have been, if he had been furnished a better opportunity to give himself, his mind and heart, more fully to coming generations through the productions of his pen. In order that the conditions which so far have impaired the usefulness of our leaders, may not be permanent, let us earnestly think of making our theological professors such in an exclusive sense.

The burdening of our leaders with a variety of duties

without mutual kinship, has wrought evil in another direction. According to the writer's ideal of theological training, the instruction of theological students needs more subjectivity than ordinary education. Our students stand in need of more than an objective treatment of the various branches of theology, of more than a drill in synthetic and analytic reasoning on matters pertaining to their sacred vocation. The spiritual side of their nature needs special attention in quality as well as in quantity. This want can be supplied by nothing as well as personal intercourse between the pupils and professors. Our professors need to disseminate not only their knowledge, they need to give their students also the benefit of their Christian manhood. Their teaching should not be limited to the lecture room, where it is measured out not individually but collectively. It should be supplemented by a personal application which will result in a clearer recognition, on the teacher's part, of his pupil's powers and weaknesses, with the resultant encouragement of the ones and guarding against the others. For such subjective teaching, of which we find the prototype in the first theological seminary with the hills of Galilee and the forest shades of Gethsemane as lecture room, no institution is so well adapted as the theological seminary, both on account of its peculiar aim and the quality and limited number of its students. I see in this an additional reason, why college and seminary should be separated, not necessarily locally, but in respect of the teaching force.

The change proposed will make both a deepening and widening of the curriculum possible. Are our teachers, our pastors satisfied with present results? Barely. A chief benefit conferred by a theological seminary is the knowledge of the ancient languages. A graduate should be expected to handle these languages as efficient tools in quarrying from the rock of the divine word the massive building stones of truth, in exploring the illimitable field of ancient lore and thus strengthening the element of scholarship in the church, secondary alone to consecration. That the majority of our graduates have no working knowledge of the Hebrew is undeniable. That some of our professors are good Hebraists, is equally patent. But, when in the seminary, we were above studying forms and inflections, too in-

dolent to wrestle with the intricacies of a language even as venerable as the sacred tongue of God's chosen people. And now, when in the ministry a thousand duties, great and small, demand our attention; when a person should reap the intellectual harvest of what was sown in the halls of learning, it demands rare strength of will to gain the working knowledge of a difficult language. When a readjustment of our teaching force has taken place on the proposed basis, it will be easier for our professors to guide their scholars to the acquisition of a branch of knowledge, the absence of which will make itself keenly felt by a person studiously inclined. It is the opinion of the writer also, that without fear of overtaxing the students' minds, some collateral branches of theology might profitably be introduced into the curriculum of the seminary. So far only essential knowledge is imparted.

There is a movement on foot, to establish a postgraduate course at Columbus. This University feature would be a desirable element of progress. The writer doubts, whether in the present stage of development we can give University instruction in classical, historical and scientific branches. However, a postgraduate course in theology has a commendable feature besides desirability; it is feasible. Even instruction by correspondence, as Dr. Weidner has connected with his Chicago seminary, would be a decided improvement upon present conditions. But can we expect our professors to take the additional burden of teaching pastors upon themselves, when they are already overtaxed? They must gain time and opportunity to equip themselves for this higher task. When pastors take a postgraduate course, it is not for the purpose of reviewing what they were taught before graduation, but of seeking new and wider fields of knowledge. The pastor who delights in searching the mysteries of ancient, semi-sacred tongues, will desire to be taught Syriac and Aramaic. The exegete will be inclined to seek guidance in the fields of Textual and Higher Criticism. There are so many collateral branches of Practical, Historical, Exegetical and Systematic Theology, that the establishment of a postgraduate course at Columbus without an increase of the teaching force, would be an utter impossibility. Yet, it is almost imperative, that our whole

synod should become a centripetal organism with wholesome influences radiating from its centre to every section and corner.

II) The suggestions made relative to the improvement of the theoretical theological course will hardly fail of finding endorsement among those who have given the matter attention. It will be more difficult to come to an agreement in the matter of what is called practical education.

I move on this ground not without misgivings. It has been said, that the weaknesses of practical education should not be discussed for fear of discouraging and offending our practical brethren. Far be it from us to look down upon brethren on account of their having had fewer opportunities than others, who notwithstanding are ready, with splendid courage, to fight the battles of the Lord. God knows, that all feelings of pride and superiority will soon give way to wholesome modesty in any one who has pitted himself against the tremendous difficulties confronting him in his work. I am rather inclined to think, that all our brethren have at heart the welfare of Zion and will heartily agree upon any measure of which the feasibility and utility commend themselves to the majority of the synod.

As far as I can ascertain, the practical seminary has never been defended upon grounds of efficiency, but only upon prudential grounds. The necessity of their existence has been based upon the inadequacy of the supply of pastors from our regular seminary and the frequent and urgent claims for laborers from a rapidly developing field. While I would emphasize the insufficiency of practical education, I am inclined to disbelieve in the necessity of their continued existence.

I am convinced that the lack of a higher education is, in general, a bar to efficiency. It is true, we want in the pulpit no scintillating play of intellectual colors. We want the word of God in its simplicity and purity, and the Word of God is enough. But the knowledge of the ancient tongues is almost essential to a thorough penetration of the truth. By the direction of the Holy Spirit the truth has been embalmed in tongues venerable and profound. Independence of judgment, the pleasure of independent research, the intelligent endorsement of acknowledged author-

ities are rendered impossible, unless instruction in the ancient languages is imparted to such an extent, that the average mind can use them as facile and obedient tools. That no branch of knowledge, even Mathematics, so uniformly develops the powers of the intellect, is a pedagogical verity which needs only to be mentioned. Such a higher education does not take a man out of touch with the masses. On the contrary, nothing tends to clearness of thought and perspicuity of expression as much as a reserve force of knowledge even without an immediate bearing upon the principal duties of the specific vocation. It is such a pleasure to read sermons of men like Hofacker and Ahlfeldt of Germany, McLaren of England, Bersier of France, because they combine a mastery of the subject with clearness of expression in a manner which commands attention by both the wise and the simple alike. The rudimentary teaching of Latin and Greek which is given at our practical seminary, can not result, except in rare cases, in mastery.

Furthermore we should insist on a higher general education being made the basis of the theological education, because changed conditions demand a higher standard. The State University, the High School, the Monthly Magazine, the Daily Paper, the modern facilities for the expedition of labor and the creation of leisure, produce independence of thought, and increased knowledge and culture also among the people. But this knowledge is often unconsecrated, this culture is often the garb of hellish unbelief and malice, and worse than that, the truth is often perverted and emasculated by sectarian teachers who have all the advantages of culture and education to place their destructive heresies in the most advantageous setting. What theories and wild speculations are not on every hand presented to the people. Theosophy and Universalism, Christian science and Clairvoyance trouble our people and these seductions of Satan are generally arrayed in the angelic garment of culture. Christians, it is true, have a safeguard in their subjective experience of grace and truth, but there are also honest doubters and honest unbelievers. And as the ambassador for Christ has a message not only for his people but also for the world he should be equipped to combat every hydra of sin. After all, sin is most dangerous in its intellectual form, error. Ed-

ucation as the times demand, is not, can not be given in the practical seminary, however competent the teachers may be. The demands of the hour suggest the abolition of the practical seminary through the process of a gradual adjustment. About the difference between the practical seminary as a system and as an institution I shall speak later.

Special reasons have been advanced for locating seminaries so far away from the synodical centre. One is the wholesome influence which such a seminary brings to bear upon the surrounding territory. This reason, I admit, has, in no small measure, been vindicated by the facts. Our Western District brethren who have recommended the abolition of the Practical Seminary at Hickory, have, I trust, not failed, to give the brethren who conduct it, due credit for what they have done. They have in their state vindicated the true Lutheran doctrine against the insidious Neo-Calvinist. They have realized, in no mean measure, the ideal of the larger professorship. They have brought about between us and the brethren of the kindred Tennessee Synod a better understanding. But after all, this very success, as knights-errant of the truth, fortifies my argument against the Practical Seminary. Let us see to it, that there is no territory without men of broad knowledge, competent for aggressive and defensive leadership, men who wield the trenchant weapon of clear logic and in whom through humble reliance upon God that courage is born which will vindicate the truth anywhere and against any one, and the practical seminary will not be needed even in the capacity of advance post.

Another reason for the establishment of our practical seminary has been given in the remoteness of much synodical territory from the centre. I doubt the cogency of this reason. The catalogues of our educational institutions show, that the three members of the seminary class of '93-'94, at Hickory, came from Ohio and Illinois respectively. Among the ten theological students of the following year three came from Ohio, four would have had Columbus equally near, while only two were from North Carolina, and one even from Germany. In the last scholastic year four are from the territory of our central institution of learning, only three from its own and four would have Columbus equally near,

for Columbus is as near to Northern Virginia and West Virginia as Hickory. But even if students, for financial reasons would prefer a seminary near at hand, is it prudent economy to maintain a seminary for the benefit of a few students? Would it not be preferable to send them to the farther place by district or congregational aid? I find it peculiar also, that many who have the bishopric in view, can not be received at once into the seminary, but must take a preparatory course ranging from one to several years. If they would be persuaded, rather to prepare themselves by a college education and to add a year to their theological course, in short, if their commendable ambition could be gratified alone at Columbus, they would be benefited and the church which they serve. If distance is such a potent argument for the establishment of additional seminaries, the time may come, when we shall locate seminaries in Texas and Washington also.

Or should the language question induce young brethren to patronize either an exclusively German or exclusively English seminary? We should oppose such selection relentlessly. No one will impute to the writer the motive, to hinder, in the very least, the normal development of the German into the English church, but I should think it wretched philosophy, for a pastor to dispense with the acquisition of the German language. The German is and always will be the classical language of Lutheran theology, as it will probably remain the classical language of philosophy. It is the duty of a pastor who aspires merely to a moderate equipment, to make the intellectual treasures of the church accessible to himself through the acquisition of a language which a Carlyle venerated and only an ignoramus will despise.

On the other hand it should be our aim, to instruct also our German youth, whether native or from abroad, in the English language. I can barely even now imagine a territory in the United States, in which the command of the English language would not greatly enhance the usefulness of the minister. Still more urgent reasons for a ready use of the English language will exist in thirty years from now. Let us hope, that in that time ministers unable to use the English language, will be found only in small numbers.

However, we shall always have use for well educated German pastors in our cities, even if they can preach only in their native tongue, and, so far, the mastery of this language, in considerable portions of our land, is not an absolute necessity. But it will be.

III) I have made the question of efficiency prominent in establishing the desirability of modifying our educational methods. Most weighty are also the economical reasons which should lead to a candid and objective discussion of this subject. Has synod overreached herself? Let the facts speak for themselves. We have in the course of a decade added two seminaries to our chief educational institution though the latter has always lacked the sine qua non of a flourishing American institution, endowments and scholarships, and stands in need of further equipment in various directions. We have commenced work among the negroes at a time when the spectre of a debt insisted upon obtruding itself upon the synod in spite of all attempts to lay it low. And now another claimant for speedy and generous help knocks at our doors and pulls at our purse strings, the pathetic progeny of Abraham. Yes, we have overreached ourselves. Our debt proves it. Increased faith would make larger hearts and produce larger offerings, but faith grows apace, not with Pentecostal rapidity. True wisdom requires the adaptation of measures to existing means and powers, rendering further extension advisable only when old fields and existing institutions are successfully maintained. Our synod, according to the wealth of her people and her size, exerts herself more than most other bodies, yet she can not do the work of a denomination. To do well what we do, not to attempt anything which we can not, humanly speaking, do well, should be our policy. If we can not foster all kinds of eleemosynary institutions, if we must abstain from many a department of mission work, let us comfort ourselves with the truth, that the Almighty has other instruments besides us, much as I wish, that our principles and doctrines were those of the Church Universal.

IV) Considerations of economy as well as efficiency point to the consolidation of our theological seminaries and the abolition of the practical seminary as an institution. I make a distinction between the practical seminary as an

institution and an educational method. However, what is to be done with the college? Could not the college be combined with the teacher's seminary? Would not our teachers be as well educated, if their course would become an eclectic collegiate course, especially as such an arrangement would enable the studious youth to acquire other knowledge not prescribed in his specific course? Would not our undergraduates be benefited by a combination, whereby access would be given them to a thorough education in both vocal and instrumental music? In this case the personnel of the college faculty might require modification, but no addition.

But even if this plan, upon mature deliberation, should prove impracticable, we could, after the abolition of the five professorships of our practical seminaries, well afford to replace our three theological professors who give no insignificant portion of their time to the college, by two men to teach college branches exclusively. Our theological professors, being enabled to give their time and energy entirely to seminary work, can direct a gradual and beneficial readjustment of conditions. We could retain the practical seminary as a method, though subordinate, even after its abolition as an institution. Even after the present pupils of our practical seminaries have finished their course, we can, as is done at Mt. Airy, receive sterling young men, who in maturity of judgment and experience, possess an equivalent of a college education, and give them a practical education alongside of the regular course, the greater part of which requires no adaptation to a special class of students. However, Columbus having become our theological Mecca, fewer and fewer students would in the course of time require a practical education.

Such a consolidation would be beneficial in most ways. It would preserve our synod from attenuation. It will be easier, in our circumscribed financial situation, to supply one institution with the elements of strength than three. It will result in a better equipment of our ministry. It will abridge the budget of our treasurer without causing considerable loss of prestige and territory. It will furnish the groundwork for a healthy development in the future. We should bend all our energies to the securing of endowment and

scholarship funds. As both faith and means increase, by the blessing of God in the course of time, we can create new professorships. And, should by the Lord's grace, external growth accompany internal progress, we could establish preparatory schools in those sections of our land where our people are found in sufficient numbers, to render them, in a measure, self-supporting.

The condition of our Columbus seminary renders a change extremely desirable. If we were financially able to raise our chief institution of learning to a higher level of efficiency, and at the same time maintain our other seminaries, a consolidation of seminaries might appear a radical measure. But when we consider that the consolidation on the basis proposed will result in increased educational facilities, a higher standard of equipment, above all, since the supply of theological graduates already threatens to exceed the demand, this proposition will commend itself to conscientious and unprejudiced consideration.

Whatever efforts, however, we may put forth, to meet the requirements of the times both on the educational and mission field, we shall remain handicapped by galling and fretting obstacles, we shall be unable, even in a measure, to see our dreams materialize, until our prayer for a larger Lutheran Church has been answered. The irenic utterances of representative men, like Prof. Ernst, in the German Magazine, the Melanchthonian influence of our General President, have done much to pave the way for a better understanding in the West. But are there no rays of hope illuminating the East? I do not know, whether my hopes and wishes are representative of those of others, but it is my individual view, that earnest efforts should be made toward a better understanding with the General Council. Far be it from me, to criticize, even faintly, the historical attitude of our synod, in standing aloof from a larger union, as long as agreement in practice as well as doctrine has not been attained. For what is practice but the application of the doctrine? Well do I realize, what grief some of our brethren have felt, when their efforts at discipline were rendered nugatory by those who profess the same principles as they. Yet let us exercise charity and not dismiss hope. We know, how difficult it is among us, to eradicate abuses, though

they are clearly recognized. There is surely a large element in the General Council which feels as we do, on the mooted questions, but is unable universally to secure the adoption of healthy methods. Let us recognize what we have in common and gladly commend what has been done in that body for the welfare of our Lutheran Zion. They have strengthened and gratified the desire of Lutherans for Liturgical improvement by the publication, in the English language, of a perfect and strictly historical liturgy. One of their men, the sainted Dr. Krauth, has given to the world a work which the English Lutheran Church will always revere as a classic. They have purged the Lutheran Church, to no small extent, of sectarian principles and doctrines. Their institutions of learning and their ministry have, in broad sections of our land, secured leadership for Lutheran scholarship. Separation from Missouri has been a blessing; for the spirit of Missouri is not and never will be, we fear, the spirit of the Lutheran Church. But, if we can join hands with the brethren East and West, in the West with Iowa, in the East with the Council, decades of effort are worth the consummation. When this consummation by the power of God's Spirit, has become more than a wish, more than a dream, more than an object of effort, a blessed reality, the conditions will exist for the creation of an educational system, as efficient as that in the fatherland, only truer to the principles of the Reformation. Beneath the foundation deep and strong which our fathers have laid; upon it a building broadly American in scope and character, gathering for its completion the united strength of brethren East and West and North and South; its crystal dome suffused by the clear light of truth; enriched by the scholarship of the ages; and above the star of hope which has ever shone upon the Church of the Reformation in her darkest hours, even at Worms, even when Gustavus Adolphus fell, a united church, nothing less, is the ideal, the object of yearning prayer, for the thoughtful Lutheran of to-day.

TRUE CHRISTIAN UNION.*

BY REV. B. F. SCHILLINGER, A. M., CANAL FULTON, OHIO.

1 Cor. 1; 10. "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."

Every true, intelligent Christian can not help but look, with bleeding heart, as the present disintegrated condition of the Church visible.. And still worse, we find constant frictions between these integral parts. The one part is forever warring against the other. These parts are spending their energies in battling with each other, instead of bringing their united forces like one mighty phalanx to bear upon the foes of Christ and His Church. Each party is trying to annihilate the other instead of doing away with party entirely and, as one united whole, striving to destroy the powers of the prince of darkness.

But under the present existing circumstances it cannot be otherwise. It would, certainly, be unwise, if in our zeal to overthrow the unbelief of the child of the world, we should forget to clean out the leaven of unbelief that is ever stealing its way right into the Church visible. Satan has not only collected his forces on the outside of the wall, but he has his agencies in the Church, when we consider her as she appears before our natural eyes, and it would be to our own harm if we did not recognize this fact and act accordingly. It is, therefore, after all, not the Church fighting the Church, when we take up arms against the errors of the sects, but it is the Church fighting unbelief wherever she may chance to find it. This has always been the state in which we find the Church militant. And she will have to continue to operate along this line as long as there is a devil. And yet we are to strive and to pray that the Church may be one in her visible form as she is one, in Jesus, in her invisible form.

---

*This paper was read before the Free Conference held in Canton, O., in the Trinity Church of which Rev. Dr. Bauslin is pastor.

This is the great end Christ teaches us to pray for in the second petition of the Lord's prayer, and the way it is to be effected He evidently intimates in the third. Hence Luther tells us, that we realize what we pray for in the third petition, "When God frustrates all wicked counsels and designs, which prevent the sanctification of His name and the coming of His kingdom,—such as those of the devil, the world, and our own flesh, and when He strengthens and preserves us in His Word, and in the faith unto the end."

If the kingdom of God had taken full possession of the heart of everyone who professes to be a Christian, then true faith in His Word would have full sway in the heart of all such professed Christians, and His will would be done. Then the Church would be one externally as she is one internally.

What, then, is true Christian unity?

In answering this question many men make very grave mistakes.

The Romish Church says: True Christian unity is to have all united under one visible head, and boasts of being in the possession of such a unity under the pope. And so anxious is she to see all men in the possession of this blessing (or rather curse), that she has caused the blood of thousands of martyrs to flow that she might perpetuate a mere outward union which after all is divided into as many sects as is the protestantism of to-day, or as Luther once said, as many sects as there are converts.

While the Romanist makes the great mistake of thinking that true Christian unity consists in having all professed Christians united under one visible head, Protestant sectarianism imagines that this ardently desired consummation consists in the Church's having many visible heads but one external fellowship. Hence it is that we hear, from every side, the cry for union, and yet, all that this spirit of mere outward union wants, to make it as intolerant and tyrannical as the papacy in the dark ages, is the ignorance and superstition that then existed.

True Christian unity does not consist in a mere external union, or fellowship. Of such a mere external union, or fellowship, we may well say as Christ once said of the hypocrites: They "are like unto whited sepulchres, which

outwardly appear beautiful, but inwardly they are full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness." Matt. 23, 27. Nowhere does the Word of God recommend such a union, but earnestly and frequently warns us against it. It is dissimulation, and the God of truth wants no dissimulation. Jer. 42, 20 reproves the Jews for dissembling in their hearts. And David says, Ps. 26, 4: "Neither will I go in with dissemblers." Do we not constantly see that whilst these sects are fellowshiping with each other they are forever seeking to devour one another? St. Paul warns us against all such fellowship when he says: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." Rom. 16: 17. True Christian unity is the unity described in our text. It is not a mere union but a unity in which all speak the same thing. As long as our creeds speak different and conflicting things there is and will be discord, just as certainly as there will be discord if the strings of the harp are tuned upon different keys; and though the strings be of gold and the case of the most costly wood, the sounds it will produce will grate upon the ear. Thus will it grate upon the ear of our God when a congregation of worshipers lifts up its voice to praise God for the gift of the Lord's Supper, and some sing this is the Lord's true body and true blood whilst others sing it is not the Lord's body and blood but only bread and wine. Or some sing it works in us the forgiveness of sin, life and salvation, whilst others sing it works in us nothing at all, but simply reminds us of the death of our Lord. There is no harmony in their creed. They do not speak the same thing, and the reason why they do not speak the same thing is because they are not of the same mind—they do not believe the same thing.

The idea is this: The Corinthians did not speak the same thing, *i. e.*, the confession of their lips is not the same because they have not the same faith in their heart. True Christian unity demands that the sameness in the expression of the lips be the effusion of the sameness as regards the thing which the hearts believe.

If the whole congregation believes in the triunity of the Godhead, they will all praise the triune God. True unity

therefore consists in all having the same thought of what God teaches in His Word, and all having the same will to worship Him in accordance with that which He teaches. Rom. 15, 6: "That ye may all with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Does God want such a unity in the Church visible, is the second question we desire to answer in this connection. This question may seem to many an unnecessary, yea even a foolish one. Because it is to us so self-evident that God wants true Christian unity, we would naturally conclude that no one would dispute it. But how often do we hear people declare that it is a good thing that we have these different religious parties and societies, since by having the Church thus divided into various sects, every reasonable person should certainly be able to find some religious body to suit his mind.

Now if it is good to have the Church visible divided into numerous sects, and if every good gift comes from God, then God is Himself the Author of these divisions and we should do nothing to disturb the arrangement which God has made. Then, too, all who are seeking to unite these sects into one organic whole, and under one head, or fellowship, either externally or internally are engaged in an effort to overthrow one of the good arrangements of God. We, of course, do not believe that it is good, or pleasing in the sight of God for the Church to be thus divided. Consequently we deny that it is God's arrangement, and declare that it is one of the devil's arrangements, through which he is to a great extent impeding the work which God gave the Church to perform, and through which he hopes to be able to get the Church to grind itself out of existence. But thanks be to God, the devil's hopes shall not be realized in this instance, for God has declared in His Word, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church.

Again, when we see how many professed Christians are exerting themselves strenuously to effect a mere outward union, which after all is no unity, and how few are willing to labor for a true unity of the Church, we are led to believe that they only consider external disintegration an evil, and that they yet think it all right for her to be di-

vided in the faith. Some claim that God is the Author of these different conflicting doctrinal views which men entertain concerning His Word, because He created man and gave him his reason and yet did not give all men such a sameness of mind that all must think the same thing, or think the same of every object brought under their mind's consideration. Thus they would say that if there is any censure connected with the Church's having so many conflicting doctrines, this censure falls upon God and not upon men. Such people forget entirely that the mind of man is by no means in the same state as it was before the fall of man in sin. If our mind were yet as the mind of Adam was before the fall we would all naturally think the same thing of all that God might see fit to reveal to us. God is not the fault of it that man fell into sin, and from this point of view can, therefore, not be the fault of it that men do not all think alike concerning His Word. But the persons who speak in this strain reveal their own mistake. It is plain that they are trying to comprehend the Word of God with their natural reason, and that they are trying to reduce everything that God has said in His Word to such a state that the natural reason can comprehend it. But what do the Scriptures say to this, 1 Cor. 2: 14: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." If we would discern things spiritually we must be spiritually minded, our reason must be taken captive by faith. Since it is one and the same Spirit who makes us spiritually minded, all who are subject to this Spirit will be of the same mind, as soon as they hear what the Word of God has spoken. It is not their natural reason but the Word of God that decides the matter. It is therefore not God's fault when men disagree on things concerning His Word but it is the fault of man's proud and perverse reason which will not submit to the decision of God's Word.

Others claim that God does not speak clearly and define plainly what He means in His Word. Thus they seek to make God the prime cause of all the dissensions in the Church, and of all the martyrs' blood that bigoted, superstitious tyrants ever shed. The Psalmist says: "The com-

mandment of the Lord is pure enlightening the mind." Ps. 19: 8. "The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple." 19: 7. If the Word of God were dark and ambiguous, could it enlighten the mind? If the simple can understand it sufficiently to be made wise by it, it certainly must be intelligible. The trouble with a great many people is that they make the Word of God enigmatical for themselves by not accepting the thought which is clearly expressed. They make the stream cloudy, and then censure the Author of the stream for not having made it clear. There never was a thought more clearly expressed, than is the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and, yet, there is, perhaps, no passage in the Word of God that men misinterpret more than those words. Why? Not because they are ambiguous, but because men will not accept the thought that they express.

God does not want divisions in His Church and He has given no occasion for the divisions that exist. God desires Christian unity and since He desires it He certainly has done nothing to prevent it, but earnestly commands it, as we see in our text when He says: "Now I beseech you." It is almighty God beseeching the Christian Church in all love, and yet in all His divine earnestness to avoid everything that might cause divisions, to practice that which will heal the wounds which have already been made and to prevent further estrangements. St. Paul would have the Corinthians understand that he is not speaking these words by his own authority, but by the authority of God, hence he adds the words "by the Lord Jesus Christ," *i. e.*, by the authority and in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. "I beseech you, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you." In the 133d Ps. God says: "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." God does not delight to see the Church in the mangled form in which we find her today, hence He puts it in the mind of the Apostle to say, Eph. 4: 13: "Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith and one baptism. One God and Father of all, who is

above all, and through all, and in you all." In that grand prayer in which Jesus impleads the Father in behalf of the Church, He says: "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are." Discord is disorder, and harmony is order, and God, being a God of order, has established order as the first rule of heaven, and He desires that the same rule shall obtain in His Church on earth. He desires that the whole body of the Church visible shall be brought to bear upon the professed antichristian world. To this end every Christian should therefore labor in accordance with the rules which God has given in His holy Word. But many have grown dissatisfied with God's mills. They seem to grind too slowly for them, so they have invented mills of their own with which they expect to grind out this much desired unity and the result of it is that instead of effecting true Christian unity they are grinding out a unionism, which breeds and fosters sectarianism, lives upon indifferentism, the incipiency of infidelity.

God wants true Christian unity and He has given us the plan according to which we are to strive to effect it, if we would succeed to any extent at all. It is not the rule of that wicked one who suggests that we discard all that portion of the Holy Scriptures concerning which we are disagreed and unite upon that which we are agreed. If we seek to build up a union on that line we will soon have but very little of God's Word remaining, for there is but very little of God's Word that is not denied by some party or other claiming to be Christian. A union built up by discarding God's Word might be found in its perfection in hell. The plan of forming such a union is the conception of the wicked one and the object he would gain by it is to rob the Christian Church of the Word of God. But does not charity suggest that the Church unite upon a platform which ignores the differences that exist between those different sections? To this question, the sectarian who loves to be rocked to sleep in the cradle of error which he has constructed, or into which he has laid himself, answers yes, But let us look at the question soberly. Does not every error which a man entertains rob him of the blessed comfort which the truth that stands opposed to such error would

give him? If a man believes that he can and must save himself in part by the deeds of the law, he loses the comfort which the true believer has in knowing and believing that Jesus Christ has saved him and that he becomes the possessor of that salvation by believing it. Would it be charitable to leave such a man go right on laboring under these disadvantages, which may end in the destruction of his soul, and to say nothing to him to apprise him of the dangerous position he is holding? That is what the false charity, that tells you to connive at the errors of your friend, would have you do. This false charity will call you bigoted and many other ugly names if you apprise your neighbor of the dangerous errors he is holding, just because you want to rescue him from the danger that is threatening him, and because you want him to possess the comfort of the truth which his error is depriving him of. There is no more charity in being silent to the differences that separate the sects from the true visible Church, than there is in allowing a foe to destroy your fellowman without apprising him of his danger. Yet this uncharitableness is what the principle of forming a union by ignoring the doctrinal differences that exist demands of us. It demands of us an enormous price. It demands indifference towards the Word of God, and the neglect of the duty we owe to God and our fellowman. It demands of us that we shall look upon our fellowman as he glides further and further towards infidelity and not raise a warning voice. And what does it give us in return for all this neglect of duty—this great sacrifice which it asks us to make? You say it offers us peace. What kind of peace? The peace that is found among the putrifying, ghastly corpses after the smoke of the battle field has passed away. You say it offers us union. What union? The union that exists between the tyrannical master and his slave. There is peace that is more to be dreaded than war. There is a union that is more to be dreaded than disunion. Such is the nature of the peace and union offered us by the principle of forming a union with the sects on the condition of treating their errors as a matter of indifference.

There is but one plan upon which true Christian unity can be effected. It is that of implicit acceptance of the

Word of God. The Apostle beseeches the Corinthians by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that they all speak the same thing. He could not beseech them by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ to speak anything but the truth as it is in Jesus. It would have been profanity for him to use the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in this connection had he meant that this "same thing" which he would have them speak was contrary to the truth as it is in Jesus. When he says: "that there be no divisions among you" he is simply expressing the immediate result that must follow where God's Word is spoken in its purity and accepted by all. In such cases all differences in doctrine will at once disappear, separated parties will be united and we will not have a mere external union, but an internal unity, and wherever this internal unity exists the external unity will follow as naturally as water runs down a hill.

Let us all see to it that we stand firmly upon the Word of God, and let us be united on that Word in doctrine and practice. Then we will be one, bound together with the eternal truth, a unity that is pleasing to God. And God, even our God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ will bless us and prosper us in the work of our hands.

A SHORT HISTORY OF SUNDAY.

AN EXTRACT FROM A DISCOURSE BY PROF. THEO. ZAHN, D. D.

BY PROF. K. HEMMINGHAUS, A. M., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Where Christianity and the Church have gained a determining influence upon the external life of nations and maintained such influence to the present day there the work of the theologian comes in contact with the interests of general education. This contact is not always of a friendly nature, for the spheres of thought and the views which constitute the import of the general education in our days, have long since become independent of the life and

doctrine of the Christian Church. But there are certain points where Christianity and culture come into friendly contact with each other. There are institutions and regulations among us, whose Christian origin is just as certain as their wholesome effect is universally recognized. The observance of Sunday or, as it is often also called, of the Lord's day is one of these institutions, and indeed one of the most important.

Heathendom has no Sunday. Neither the nations of the classical antiquity nor our heathen ancestors knew of a holiday which returned regularly after short intervals and on which the whole people, freed from the constraint of daily labor, felt the privilege and duty to occupy their thoughts with higher and nobler things. We Christians have such a day, and as certain as it bestows a continued blessing upon us so certain is it that we are indebted to the Christian Church for this day. Our people still have their Sunday, but there is sufficient ground in our days to speak of a "*Sonntagsfrage.*" It is indeed a question whether our people will retain their Sunday or regain the day, wherever it has been lost. Who will deny that this day among us has lost a great deal of its former dignity? A little more desecrations and what the socialist Proudham said in reference to France about 50 years ago will also apply to us, at least to our large cities: "Sunday in the large cities is hardly anything else than a day of celebration without any motive and aim, an opportunity to parade for the children and women, a day of increased consumption of liquor and wine in the restaurants and wine shops, a day of degrading idleness and excessive pleasure. Nevertheless I say: We still have a Sunday; it still lives in the heart of many and in the conscience of our people. How it has come into existence I shall endeavor to show in the following pages. The abundance of material on hand demands restriction and I can therefore describe only the origin and the first development of the observance of Sunday.

In the medieval age, probably in the 8th century, a letter had been manufactured, of which it has been claimed that Christ wrote it in heaven and then let it fall to the earth. Some claim that the letter was found at Jerusalem, others at Rome. In this letter the Lord demands of His

people under threats of the severest punishments for time and eternity, to keep Sunday holy by refraining from all labor and by diligently visiting the services of the house of God. Here we have the extreme reverse of the original idea of Sunday. Sunday is no institution and no command of Christ; and however closely it is connected with the history of Christianity it is not quite as old as this. Yet in order to understand its origin, it is necessary to go back to the beginning and first development of Christianity.

Jesus by His birth became a member of the Jewish people and a subject of the Mosaic law. As such He willingly recognized both, but never for a moment forgot that His calling reached beyond the Jewish people. Accordingly He often came into conflict with customs and opinions and views, that had hitherto been in vogue. Jesus always opposed the notion, as if He had come to overthrow the order of things which existed among His people by divine and human right. On the contrary, His aim was to give true import and life to the forms which were given by the Mosaic law to the Jewish people. He also observed the festivals of the people of Israel and especially the Sabbath. "As His custom was"—so we read—He visited the synagogue on the Sabbath day. The services in the synagogue on this day and the custom to invite the Rabbi from abroad, who had come into the synagogue to address the audience, offered Him an opportunity to proclaim His new doctrine. But the great punctiliousness with which the majority of the people under the direction of its teachers at that time understood and observed the law of the Sabbath day was always foreign to Him. As we all know the contest between Jesus and the Pharisees and later with the government of His people resulted mainly from this, that Jesus and His disciples did things on the Sabbath day which they denounced as a desecration. When the Lord on the Sabbath day went through the corn field, and His disciples were a hungered and began to pluck the ears of corn and to eat, the Pharisees who saw it said unto Him: "Behold, Thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the Sabbath day." Matt. 12, 1. 2. When Jesus more than once and certainly not without intention on the Sabbath day

healed the sick and demanded of these to use their strength, which they had regained, by taking up their bed and going thence, some of the Pharisees said: "This man is not of God, because He keepeth not the Sabbath day." John 9, 16. But Jesus never admitted that He in this or in any other point broke the law. He proves to His opponents from the law itself, which was sacred to Him also, that the lawgiver knows higher and nobler aims and ends than the mere ceremonial keeping of the Sabbath, yea, that priest and layman had been directed by the law to break the letter of the law regarding the Sabbath by diverse works. He shows from sacred history that also the honored heroes of the Old Testament in case of urgent necessity broke the ceremonial ordinances and their conduct suffered no reproach. He goes back to the wording of the law of the Sabbath, which asserts that the Sabbath of the people of Israel is an imitation of the Sabbath which God observed subsequent to the work of creation. From this follows, that according to the original meaning of the law, the observance of this day does not consist in inactivity, but in another, higher kind of activity, for that Sabbath of God which the Israelites were to imitate on the seventh day of the week is replete with the world-preserving activity of God. Jesus and His disciples therefore prove themselves to be very pious Israelites when they omit on the Sabbath day whatever may be properly called every day labor, but keep the Sabbath holy by doing good. "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." Mark 2, 27.

From this truth, by which the right relation between the sanctity of the Sabbath and the life of man is restored Christ derives the other: "Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." One might infer from this, that if the object of the Sabbath is to serve man and not to tyrannize over him, man is the lord of this day; every man has the right to determine whether and how and when he will observe it. But that would be a wrong conclusion. Our Lord asserts such lordship only of Himself, the Son of man. He has the power to overthrow the most sacred ordinances, where and whenever they are no longer adapted to fulfill their object. But He never made any other use

of this power than to fulfill the law of the Sabbath according to the spirit and true meaning of its letter, and in His long contests with the Pharisees He finally forced these to drop their original accusations against Him. Jesus was crucified not as a Sabbath-breaker, but as a blasphemer, because He said that He was the Son of God.

The oldest Church, the twelve apostles and the congregation at Jesuraselm which gathered about them, strictly observed the Sabbath of the Old Testament. It is a mistake to suppose that they with their acceptance of the gospel of Christ immediately broke away from all the laws and regulations of the Jews. The reverse is the case. The Jewish Christians at Jerusalem and in Palestine up to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans generally kept the ceremonial law. They wanted to be Jews in spite of their Christian confession. They observed the Jewish festivals; they visited the temple at the usual hours of prayer; they brought sacrifice. We are safe in the assumption that they strictly observed the Sabbath, even if this is not stated with express words. Had they not done so the Jews would have stoned them to death. Instead of that we learn from the Acts that they at times were held in high respect by the Jews around them. James, the brother of Jesus, for many years the leading person in the congregation at Jerusalem, was called by the Jews the Just on account of his strict observance of the law. Acts 21, 20 the same James informs us that in his time there were many thousands of Jews who believed in Christ, and they all were "zealous of the law." In how far they evinced their Christian faith in special forms of services and in distinguishing certain days which had become insignificant for Christians, is a question that need not be discussed here. All that is necessary for us now is to establish the fact that the earliest Christians strictly observed the Mosaic law and consequently also the Sabbath of the Jewish people. In this respect they not only followed the example but also the instruction of our Savior. Christ not only refused to act the part of a revolutionist against the ordinances of the Jewish people, but He even made it the duty of His disciples to observe the Mosaic law. A practical lesson we find Matt. 17, 24-27. "When they were come to Capernaum,

they that received tribute money came to Peter, and said, Doth not your Master pay tribute? He saith: Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying: What thinkest thou, Simon, of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute, of their own children or of strangers? Peter saith unto Him: Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him: Then are the children free. Notwithstanding lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up, and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take and give unto them for me and thee." The lesson which Christ wants to teach us with this is plain. Jesus and those that are His belong to a new order of things; they constitute a congregation which stands above the people of Israel and its revealed law and cultus. But in order not to offend those tribute collectors and all the Jews, zealous of their law, Peter is commanded to pay for himself and his Master the tribute to the temple. As long as the temple stands and the people, whose place of worship it is, waits for the judgment upon Jerusalem, so long shall the Jewish Christians respect the cultus of the temple and restrict the use of their liberty.

But the teaching and example of Christ were no longer applicable when the gospel of Christ crossed the boundaries of Palestine and in the cities of Asia and Europe Christian congregations were organized which were principally made up of former heathens. The question arose: How shall these congregations attain a custom that corresponds to their Christian faith and in what relation shall they stand to the congregations, consisting of former years? Jesus had told His disciples on various occasions that after His departure the gospel would be brought to the Gentiles and conquer the world, but as to the relation which the Christian, won from heathendom, should occupy over against the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem and other places, He had left no direction. The above-stated question, therefore, soon became a burning question and demanded a careful consideration. In answering the question the great missionary among the heathen, the Apostle Paul, maintained that the Mosaic law had been given to the people of Israel and only to them and that it was not intended to be

the rule and norm for the church from all nations. With all reverence for Old Testament revelation and although firmly convinced that the calling and significance of Israel had not yet come to an end, He nevertheless felt sure that the Jewish people should not absorb all other nations. Jews and Gentiles were to be united in one Church, and the latter were not expected to become Jews wholly or in part by accepting the Mosaic law or a part of it. Faith in Christ Jesus, the Son of the one God, whom the heathen do not know, the Savior of all men, makes a person a full member of the congregation that worships Christ as its Lord. The duties of such members towards their Lord, their brethren and, in fact, toward all men are not to be derived from the law of Moses or the Ten Commandments, but follow directly from the faith of the Christians and the nature of things. The Apostle Paul and the other Jewish Christians who became his colaborers even went a step further. The welfare of the heathen world was to them of greater importance than mere regard for the feeling of the Jews. If they wanted to convert the heathen and enter into brotherly communion with the newly converted, they themselves must cease, in many respects, to be Jews. In this way Paul became a Greek to the Greeks and as far as his influence reached the Jewish Christians in those congregations which in their great majority consisted of people who were won over from the heathen world followed his example. But these principles did not meet with the universal consent of all the Jewish Christians. A long controversy arose. At a meeting at Jerusalem the question of dispute was carefully considered. After a long and earnest discussion the apostles and heads of the congregation at Jerusalem publicly sanctioned Paul's principles in regard to missionary work and the founding of the Church among the heathen. It was resolved "to lay upon the brethren which were of the Gentiles no greater burden than these necessary things, that they abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication." Acts 15, 28. 29. Among the four necessary things neither the observance of the Sabbath nor the institution of any other holiday is mentioned. This is of the utmost importance for the right understanding of the origin

of the Sunday as also of the order of service in the Christian Church. We learn from this that not only Paul, but all the apostles meant to leave the order of divine service in the Gentile Church to the custom that would form itself in accordance with the faith of the Christians in Christ Jesus. When therefore some years later Judaistic teachers broke into the congregation at Colossa, Paul wrote to the members of the congregation: "Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of holidays, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." Col. 2, 16.

The first traces of a Sunday observance show themselves in those circles which were under the controlling influence of St. Paul. The congregation at Jerusalem was in great want. When the congregations in Asia Minor, Macedonia and Greece heard of the need of their brethren they at once set to work to raise a collection. Paul wrote to the congregation at Corinth: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings, when I come." 1 Cor. 16, 1. 2. Why did Paul propose just this day, the day after the Jewish Sabbath, to the congregation at Corinth, as he already before had proposed it to the congregation in Galatia? The answer may be found in the universal custom of the church of the subsequent centuries to place on this day as on the day of the divine service, an offering for the poor on the table of the congregation. When Paul on his last journey to Jerusalem for several days abode at Troas, the congregation of the place assembled on the first day of the week and Paul preached until midnight. When after the death of Paul the apostle John passed over into Asia Minor and from Ephesus directed the church, which Paul had founded in that province, he found there the custom of observing the first day of the week, and he sanctioned the custom. In his book of Revelation we meet the Christian Sunday for the first time under the name which it always had in the old Church, "the Lord's day." Rev. 1, 10.

It was but natural that the Christian Sunday should gain great importance in the congregations which the apostle Paul founded and organized. If we remember that the

apostle had succeeded in keeping from his field of labor every observance of Jewish holidays, we certainly are not mistaken in our assumption that the observance of Sunday must have rapidly spread throughout the Church. The Church historians from the beginning of the second century always speak of it as a universal Christian custom. And also among the heathen it soon became known as a peculiar day of the Christians. About the year 112 Pliny in his request to the emperor Trajan says that among the many Christians who were brought before him to be examined, some related that it had been customary among them to come together on a fixed day before daybreak, to sing songs of praise to Christ Jesus, and to pledge themselves by a solemn vow to a virtuous life. In the year 150 Justin, the martyr, sent a detailed petition to the emperor at Rome, in which he endeavored to prove the innocence of the Christians, by describing their way of worshiping God. He says with reference to the Christian Sunday: On the so called day of the sun there is a general meeting of all the Christians from the cities and the country. The reminiscences of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read. Then follows the address, in which the congregation is admonished to accept the truth and to walk in the way of truth and righteousness. Thereupon we all rise and perform our prayer. After the prayer, bread, wine and water are brought forward, prayers and thanksgiving are offered up unto God. Then follows the distribution of the consecrated elements. All present take part in the celebration. But the wealthier among us, if they are inclined, give, every one according to his means, an offering, with which the widows and orphans are provided. Such was the observance of Sunday among the Christians 1700 years ago.

If the Christians of the first centuries are asked for their particular reasons for distinguishing just sun's day, they unanimously reply: We celebrate this day, because Christ has risen on this day from the dead. Sunday was therefore throughout considered as a day of joy. Only on this day did the service terminate in the celebration of the Lord's supper; the "Lord's supper" belongs to the "Lord's day." To fast on Sunday was regarded as highly improper.

As a matter of course the Christians abstained on this day from all unnecessary labor. But it is very significant that for the original spirit of Christian Sunday celebration, that in the older church literature no mention is made of this. A person was indeed censured if he excused his staying away from public service with overwork at home, however not the labor on Sunday, but the over estimation of daily occupation, of which indifference toward the Word of God and the services of the congregation is the inevitable result, is put down as a sin. The same view still predominated in the fourth century. The Christians were admonished to distinguish Sunday by refraining as much as possible from daily labor so that those around them might see that they were Christians and not Jews or Gentiles. It is apparent that the views of the early Christians differ greatly from that which can be found in some sections of the Church to-day.

A new time for the Church, a new period also in the history of the Christian Sunday, began with Constantine the Great. This emperor favored the celebration of Sunday even before he became a Christian. In the year 321 he issued a Sunday law, which introduced Sunday as a day of rest into his whole empire. Sunday labor ceased. The farmer alone was permitted to labor on this day, inasmuch as his labors are so much dependent upon the weather and the season and cannot well suffer a regular interruption. The emperor also issued orders to allow Christian soldiers in his army to visit the services on Sunday and he also arranged a kind of Sunday services for the heathen soldiers.

The successors of Constantine were not as violent and fantastic. Sunday remained indeed in the fourth and fifth centuries an object of imperial legislature, but this took another and on the whole healthier course in legislating. The Sunday legislation in the century following Constantine was on the one hand more Christian and on the other more tolerant. It became more Christian inasmuch as the state showed that it had due regard for the feeling of Christians, and more tolerant since it did not compel unchristian subjects to the observance of the Christian Sunday.

True there were always some who maintained that Christ Himself instituted the Christian Sunday, discontinued the Mosaic Sabbath and substituted Sunday for it.

Accordingly they favored a rigorous observance of the day and a rigorous Sunday legislation to carry out their whims. But the notions of these people have never become predominant. The Church as such believed and taught that Sunday is the natural outgrowth of the Christians' faith in Christ Jesus.

In the centuries before the Reformation a doctrine in regard to Sunday prevailed in the Church which was diametrically opposed to the views which have called this day into existence and which were held by the Church from the time of the apostle Paul to Augustin. It is the doctrine that the observance of Sunday has taken the place of the observance of the Sabbath commanded by Moses in the Old Testament. No wonder that under the influence of such doctrine emperors and kings would employ violence to enforce a rigorous Sunday observance. No wonder that people believed the really correct way of keeping Sunday holy consisted in this, that a person abstain from all and every labor. The views that caused the apostle Paul so much trouble in his labors among the Galatians and Colossians had revived and they were doing a great deal of mischief.

The Reformers opposed this doctrine with all their might. It is really surprising how Luther who has laid greater stress upon the signification of the Ten Commandments than any one before him, has nevertheless from the very beginning taken the true evangelical standpoint and restored the early Christian view of the Sunday. In his Larger Catechism Luther says explicitly that the third commandment as an institution of the observance of the seventh day has been given "only to the Jews." The third commandment in Luther's Catechism reads: "Thou shalt sanctify the holy-day." By substituting the word holy-day for the word Sabbath Luther has indicated the correct explanation of God's commandment. The word holy-day includes Sunday as well as all other days of divine service. He admonishes to keep these days holy and especially the Sunday, which meets not only a want of nature, but especially the want of Christians for a common service and which deserves the preference above all other days of the week, because the Church has always distinguished it. Luther moreover protests against the opinion, as if there

were a religious duty of celebrating just this day or any other day of the week. What God commands in the third commandment is nothing else than love to Him and His holy Word. But this love will always create a desire in the Christian's heart to hear the Word in the public services of the congregation. And what God will punish in transgressing the third commandment is nothing else than contempt of His Word and indifference toward the service and public preaching resulting therefrom. And this has not only been a private opinion of Dr. Luther but the doctrine of the Lutheran Church.

OUTLINES OF SERMONS ON FREE TEXTS.

BASED ON THE GERMAN OF J. HEINRICH SCHULTZE BY PROF. A. PFLUEGER, A. M., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MARK 12, 41–44.

WHAT IMPARTS TO OUR GENEROSITY ITS TRUE VALUE?

The fact that it is practised

I. *For pious ends* 41;

1. The widow's mite, which the Lord praises, was given to defray the expenses of the temple worship;
2. Our charitable gifts have value when they are given
   a. For the House of God, to build and preserve churches and schools,
   b. For the Word of God, to spread it far and wide,
   c. For the Work of God, to help it along on earth by service in mission work.

II. *From a good Heart* 41–42;

1. The widow's mite which the Lord praises was not the result of necessity, but was the gift of her good, free will;

2. Our charitable gifts have value when they are given
   a. From a willing heart, full of pity for the need of others;
   b. From a disinterested heart, not for honor and praise, but perhaps for blame,
   c. From a thankful heart which desires to repay the benefits from our Heavenly Father by doing good to our fellow men;

III. *To the Best of One's Ability* 43–44.

1. The widow's mite, which the Lord praises, is not given from overabundance, but from poverty;
2. Our charitable gifts have value when they are given
   a. According as has been given to us. The rich should be ashamed of giving a penny, but the poor can rejoice in so doing.
   b. In the manner that the circumstances demand; sometimes, money and goods; sometimes, time and service should be given.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MATT. 11, 16-24.

THE LORD'S CRY OF WOE TO THOSE WHO DESPISE HIM.

We notice

I. *The Sin concerning which [illegible];*

The Lord laments over the generation of His day 16, especially over Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernum, 21-23, three cities of His native country, presents them before all others and punishes them

1. On account of their wilfulness, they are like capricious children 16, 17 and are satisfied neither with the earnest John nor the friendly Son of man 19;

2. On account of their self-conceit; in their pride they think themselves too good for the teaching from above;

3. On account of their prejudice against Him; stubbornly they harden their hearts against the heavenly wisdom which Christ has brought and by miracles proved to them;

II. *The Punishment, with which—;*

It is

1. Not a temporal one,
   a. No earthly ruler threatens the despisers of Christ as long as they do not transgress the civil laws,
   b. However, the heavenly Judge does, although He often mercifully permits them to abide here for some time;
2. But an eternal one, viz. the Day of Judgment 22-24 which is
   a. Certain in its coming,
   b. Unchangeable in its decisions,
   c. hard to endure in its punishment;

III. *The Purpose, for which they are Threatened;*

They should be admonished by the threat

1. To give up their wicked ways; which
   a. surely will lead them to eternal,
   b. often to temporal ruin;
2. To accept the way of salvation; which
   a. by faith in Jesus,
   b. and by repentance to Him is still open to them.

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

LUKE 18, 1-8.

THE ADMONITION OP THE LORD TO CONTINUE IN PRAYER AND SUPPLICATION.

We notice

I. *To Whom given;*

To those praying, who in consequence of the delayed answer of their prayer 1-4

1. Become weak of faith and full of doubt;
   a. as if prayer in general did not help,
   b. as if *their* prayer in particular were of no use;
2. Become distrustful and displeased with God;
   a. as if He in general did not wish to rescue them,
   b. or not in the wished for manner;

II. *On What Founded;*

On this that

1. Our adversary, against whom we beg help, never leaves us;
   a. he is: devil, world, flesh,
   b. his attacks: exposition of sixth petition;
2. Our need of help does not leave us:
   a. Needs of body,
   b. Needs of soul;
3. Our Judge will not leave us in the lurch; for
   a. God is just the opposite of the wicked judge,
   b. we are dearer to God than was the woman to the judge,
   c. we have a better chance to entreat God than the woman the unjust judge;

III. *How it is Received;*

This admonition

1. Should indeed find a joyful reception everywhere, for it tends not only
   a. to the good of him who prays; but also
   b. to the honor of God;
2. but is not always well received; many are wanting in
   a. the faith of this widow,
   b. faith in the Lord.

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MATT. 16, 13-20.

ST. PETER'S CONFESSION OF JESUS AS THE CHRIST.

We notice

I. *Of what kind it was;*

This confession of Peter was

1. Not in agreement with the spirit of the times;
   a. the spirit of the times held Jesus to be only a forerunner of the Messiah's kingdom 14,
   b. just as the spirit of our times holds Jesus to be the noblest and best man that ever lived, and nothing more;
2. Originating deep in Peter's own soul 15 and caused by the Spirit of God 17, such a confession

a. which alone in itself is true, and
b. which alone has meaning and worth;

II. *What its Purport was;*

It says 16, that Jesus is

1. The Christ, that is, the Savior, promised by the prophets,

2. The Son of the living God, in closest relation with the Almighty God,

III. *What Recognition it Found;*

With the Lord, who

1. Calls the confessor (and also those in whose name Peter confessed 15) blessed 17, because such a confession
   a. is not a miserable invention of men,
   b. but a beneficent gift of God;

2. Gives the confessor (and the remaining disciples) the honor-bringing promise, that
   a. He would build His Church on this confession 18,
   b. and give them the Office of the Keys;

IV. *What Concealment it Suffered;*

The command 20

1. is remarkable;
2. can be explained by the circumstances;

V. *What meaning it has for us;*

It should be and remain according to the explanation of the Lord

1. The rock of the Church of Christ on earth;
2. The sign of our membership in the Christian Church.

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MATT. 16, 21-28.

HOW WE BECOME THE FOLLOWERS OF THE LORD IN TRIBULATION.

We become so, if we after the example of the Lord

I. *Expect Tribulation:*

1. As Jesus did 21;

2. So should we as His followers also do, while we consider, that tribulation
   a. is certain,
   b. in a short time may visit us;

II. *In Tribulation honor God's Will;*
   1. As Jesus did; for
      a. He discourages Peter's well-meant but shortsighted rebuke as not well done,
      b. and condemns it most earnestly with reference to God's will 23;
   2. So should we also as His followers do, while we
      a. do not shortsightedly and fearful of suffering consider only that which lies immediately before us,
      b. but recognize in tribulation God's holy will;

III. *Prepare ourselves for Tribulation;*
   1. As Jesus did 21,
   2. So should we also as His followers do, and prepare ourselves for tribulation
      a. by self-denial,
      b. by willingness to suffer;

IV. *In Tribulation guard ourselves against earthly Pleasure;*
   1. As Jesus did Matt. 4, 8-10, who there under the pressure of tribulation
      a. was not despondent and anxious for His life,
      b. and did not lust for earthly possessions;
   2. So should we as His followers also do, while we bear our cross for Jesus' sake,
      a. that we may not be alarmed for our true welfare 25;
      b. that we may not be injured by earthly pleasures 26.

V. *Look beyond Tribulation;*
   1. As Jesus did in looking forward to His resurrection 21 and last judgment 27. 28;
   2. So should we also as His followers do, while we consider in tribulation
      a. its early end,
      b. its recompense in heaven.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MATT. 9, 9-13.

JESUS IS THE PHYSICIAN OF THE SICK.

We notice Him to-day in this His calling and see

I. *Which Sick He Visits;*

In His love He seeks out all who in their souls

1. Feel themselves sick in sin, who
   - *a.* are oppressed by the knowledge of their sin and guilt,
   - *b.* and see in themselves no help for their iniquity;
2. Or also do not feel that they are sick in sin,
   - *a.* blinded by self-righteousness,
   - *b.* trusting in themselves, lean on their own strength,
   - *c.* in self-exaltation look down on others;

II. *What Reception He finds;*

1. A very joyful one in the case of Matthew and those like him. The former
   - *a.* leaves all,
   - *b.* busies himself with the Lord;
2. A very unfriendly one in the case of the Pharisees, who
   - *a.* for themselves resist Jesus,
   - *b.* and also try to make others offended at Jesus;

III. *What Healing He Brings;*

According as the man is:

1. Those desiring salvation—publicans and sinners—He admonishes to repentance; they should
   - *a.* have contrition and sorrow for their sins,
   - *b.* give themselves to Him in faith and obedience;
2. Those who despise salvation—Pharisees—He instructs in all earnestness about salvation,
   - *a.* on account of their blindness,
   - *b.* on account of their lack of love;
3. The partakers of salvation He defends and answers for;

IV. *What Thanks He Receives;*

He receives

1. Ingratitude from many;
2. Hearty gratitude from few.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

JOHN 5, 1–15.

WHAT A GLORIOUS RESULT HAS LONG-SUFFERING!

It brings about that the sick person

I. *Is strongly Reminded of his Helplessness;*

1. The knowledge of his helplessness comes
   - *a.* to this sick man who had doubtless used all natural means to cure him, but in vain,
   - *b.* similar is the case of sick persons to-day;
2. The glorious result of this knowledge is humility;

II. *Is Directed solely to the Help of the Lord;*

1. The only hope remains
   - *a.* in the case of this sick man, the miraculous help of God,
   - *b.* this is the state of mind of all long-suffering men;
2. The glorious fruit of this state of mind is this, that the Lord
   - *a.* either takes the suffering away from His people or at least modifies it,
   - *b.* or strengthens them with patience and trust to bear it,
   - *c.* or takes them from all suffering to heaven;

III. *Is earnestly Warned away from his old sinful Ways;*

1. The warning of the Lord applies
   - *a.* to this sick man who is hereafter to lead a pious life,
   - *b.* to all who recover to do likewise;
2. The glorious result of this warning is shown in the case of this sick man who becomes a willing confessor of Jesus.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

JOHN 5, 16–23.

HOW THE LORD DEFENDS HIMSELF AGAINST THE ACCUSATION OF BREAKING THE SABBATH.

In His defence

I. *He Justifies His Action in regard to the Sabbath* 16–17;

Inasmuch as He

1. Shows the people in the text their misinterpretation of Deut. 15, 35 thus, that
   a. the heavenly Law-giver did not discontinue His works of love on the Sabbath,
   b. therefore that a work of love done to the sick man was no breaking of the Sabbath;
2. And gives us the direction
   a. not to discontinue works of love on the day of worship,
   b. but diligently to practice them;

II. *He Asserts His Divine Dignity* 18–22;

Inasmuch as He, moved by the exasperation of His accusers over the assertion of His relation to the Father, and for the purpose of their conversion,

1. Certifies to the people in the text with a double "verily"
   a. His equality in power and nature with the Father,
   b. that this equality would be further revealed by still greater works;
2. And imparts to us strengthening of faith,
   a. to defend ourselves mightily against the dangers of the divinity of the Lord,
   b. to protect ourselves from indecision concerning Christ and timidity of heart;

III. *He Demands Suitable Honor* 23;

Inasmuch as He, asking instead of accusation rather confession from them

1. Explains to the people in the text, that
   a. it is proper that He receive equal honor with the Father,
   b. this His honor is inseparable from the honor of the Father,
   c. the honor denied to Him is honor denied to the Father;
2. And gives us the admonition
   a. to confess His name,
   b. to spread His honor.

NOTES FOR SERMONS ON VARIOUS TOPICS.

BY REV. G. T. COOPERRIDER, A. M., ST. PAUL, OHIO.

MISSIONARY—MATTH. 28, 18-20.

MISSIONARY WORK A DUTY OF THE CHURCH.

I. *Why is it a duty of the Church?*

a. Because the Lord so commands.
b. Because He has furnished her with the only means through which this work can be done, viz., Word and Sacrament.
c. Because of the great need: 1. at home, 2. abroad.
d. Because of the Lord's promise, v. 20; Mark 16, 16.

II. *How can this duty be performed?*

a. By earnest prayer and supplication. Luke 10, 2.
b. By offering her sons as laborers.
c. By liberal contributions to every department of Church work.

Or:

MISSION WORK A DUTY OF THE EV. LUTH. CHURCH.

I. *Why it is her duty.*

a. She is included in Christ's command.
b. She has the divinely ordained means—pure Word and Sacrament.
c. She has grand opportunities before her, both at home and abroad.
d. She certainly has the Lord's promise to comfort and strengthen her in this great work.

II. *How this duty can be discharged.*

a. By praying for faithful laborers.
b. By offering her sons for the work.
c. By preparing her sons for the work. (Schools.)
d. By an earnest devotion to the Lord's cause in general.

EDUCATION—EPHESIANS 6, 4.

CHRISTIAN TRAINING.

I. *Its necessity.*

a. God's Word requires it. Deut. 6, 7; Prov. 23, 22; Col. 3, 20.

b. Depraved human nature needs it. Gen. 8, 21; Ps. 51, 5; John 3, 5. 6.

II. *Its accomplishment.*

a. By the influences of a Christian home,—a home where Christ reigns, and where His Word is loved and learned.

b. By means of the catechetical class and parish school.

c. By the establishment and maintenance of such institutions of learning as will fully supply the needs of our sons and daughters.

FUNERAL—2 TIM. 5, 7-8.

THE APOSTLE'S CONSOLATION IN VIEW OF APPROACHING DEATH.

I. *In regard to his past life.*

Calmly viewing the situation he was able to say:

a. "I have fought a good fight."—The good fight of faith. 1 Tim. 6, 12.

b. "I have finished my course,"—the time allotted me is now about spent, no more fighting with the world, the devil and the flesh. Rom. 7, 14-23; Eph. 6, 12.

c. "I have kept the faith,"—by the grace of God, persevered unto the end. Rev. 14, 13.

(Application.)

II. *In regard to his future prospects.*

a. "There is laid up for me a crown of righteousness,"—the crown of eternal life awaits me.

b. "The Lord, the righteous Judge will give it me,"—it is a gift, and an inheritance secured to me through Christ's merits apprehended by faith.

c. And this crown is for all others "who love His appearing."

(Application to life and faith of the deceased.)

Admonition and exhortation.

PSALM 34, 19.

"MANY ARE THE AFFLICTIONS OF THE RIGHTEOUS; BUT THE LORD DELIVERETH HIM OUT OF THEM ALL."

In considering this text, let us inquire:

I. *Who are the righteous?*

a. Not the self-righteous, or those reckoned as righteous when measured by worldly standards, but

b. Only those who are Christ's by faith.

II. *What is said of them?*

a. Their afflictions are many. Prov. 24, 26; 2 Tim. 3, 11; Matt. 24, 26.

b. But the Lord delivereth them; this is done in several ways:

1. By removing the afflictions,
2. By giving grace to endure them,
3. By calling the righteous to that blessed home where afflictions never come. Rev. 21, 4.

Or:

I. *The righteous.*

II. *Their afflictions.*

III. *Their deliverance.*

A MIRROR FOR PASTORS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF GUTHE BY REV. W. E. TRESSEL, BALTIMORE, IND.

THE WARMTH OF THE SERMON.

In the Latin grammarian Donatus *Amo* (I love) comes first, then follows *Doceo* (I teach)—says an old master of Pedagogics. That concerns also the preacher. Love is the sun of the soul. Where the love which is wrought by the Holy Ghost speaks forth from the preacher, there is

more than heat, there is warmth. What compassionate men were the apostles of the Lord."For the love of Christ constraineth us" (2 Cor. 5, 14), we hear St. Paul say. "My little children" (teknia mou) is the way in which John addresses the readers of his epistle (I, 2, 3). Even to the lost young man he cried: "Why, my son, dost thou flee from me, thy father? My son, fear not; thou hast yet the hope of life....Be believing. Christ hath sent me." And through the compassionate love of John the wayward youth was moved to tears and saved. Elisha, when holding before Hazael his wicked deeds, wept, and our Lord wept when He beheld the city against which He had to denounce judgment, and Paul speaks with tears of the enemies of the cross of Christ. Should not the preacher learn therefrom that love dare not fail even when he must be a severe messenger? If tempest, earthquake and fire precede, the gentle zephyr will be felt at last.

Preachers with warm, loving, compassionate hearts have ever been the first to obtain entrance to hearts. "It is not sufficient that one speak the truth, one must also speak the truth in love, that is, while testifying thereof, one must also live in it. This is the reason why publicly and often, so much that is good and true is said concerning the depravity of man, concerning the love of God, concerning the way to eternal life, and yet in so few cases something is effected. When, in a company of ministers, the conversation turned on a brother who had fallen out with his congregation it was asked: 'What does he preach?' and some one answered: 'He preaches love with a vengeance!' Yes, so it happens not seldom, not only among us pastors, but with very many, who would bear witness of the truth to others. While they speak to us of the love of God, they do it in such an offensive and insolent manner, that their sermon of love only stirs up wrath. O, whoever does not live in love, should not venture to testify of love; whoever does not himself tremble before God on account of sin, should not preach against sin. But whoever has in God his vital air and element, let him know that the victory of God accompanies him."

Luther, of whom it was said: "Each of thy words was a thunder-clap," nevertheless spoke to his congregation as

a father to his children; he had a loving heart for his people, and in the meanest person he saw a brother whom Christ had ransomed. Woltersdorf said: Love, Christ's love, must fill my whole heart, must urge my soul toward the flock, must beam from my eyes and show itself in kindness and courtesy to all men. Love must ever bring me more and more to the point, where in an honest way I become all things to all men. "O that I were all heart," said Rowland Hill, "all soul and spirit, to speak to the lost multitude the glorious gospel of Christ."

§ 28. THE SIMPLICITY OF THE SERMON.

Where there is love, there will be clearness (ubi caritas, ibi claritas), says Hugo of St. Victor. And a writer on homiletics in our day (Nesselmann) says in his concise work: Preach warmly; then you will not preach pompously, but your discourse will flow in natural beauty, and that is the noblest oratory. The addresses of Christ are all simple, and grand in their simplicity. Paul was an eloquent man, in consequence they of Lystra looked upon him as Mercury, he did not however declare divine truth "with enticing words of man's wisdom," but in simplicity, which, to be sure, was accompanied with "demonstration of the Spirit and of power." Plainness coupled with the power of the Spirit is the style of Christ and His apostles. High words, abstract speeches go over the people's heads and find no entrance in their hearts. What is the use of a golden key that does not unlock? What do cocoa-nuts with their rich nourishment benefit hungry children who do not understand how to open them? Socrates did not trouble himself with hunting after beautiful words; trusting in the internal power of the truth, he despised the unworthy rhetorical arts and yet his homely discourse exercised kingly authority over men's minds. Cato also was not a man of oratorical elegance, his speech was plain but exerted an eminent influence upon his hearers: for it carried with it the force of deeply grounded conviction. And does the Christian preacher think that he must, with beautifully sounding, highly ornate phrases win respect and authority for God's Word, in which resides the power of God, an

intrinsic force and virtue? Would that not be lighting a match in order to add brilliance to the sun? No, the Word of God does not need rhetorical gloss to make it powerful. "The bare and simple truth is beauty enough in itself," says Lactantius, the Christian Cicero. Simplicity in language is demanded by love. Or would it not be a want of love, if one were to speak to the congregation in such a way that it could receive no spiritual gain, no edification?

Pascal makes the remark, that there are two classes of discourse: the one is that of the understanding, the other is that of love. That of the understanding allows no deviations from the rules of rhetoric and dialectics. That of love consists in having a heart so permeated with the truth that one cannot be held by the limits of the other method, while the soul and theme are interwrapped with each other. Just this, which the French thinker calls the method of love in discourse, Claus Harms no doubt had in view when he advised: preach incorrectly! The original man wanted to say nothing else than this Follow the inspirations of the loving heart, which expresses itself as opportunity and the need of souls require, and don't bother yourselves if everything isn't exactly conformed to the rules of rhetoric, if, for instance, one part of the discourse is longer than another. Luther practiced this license of love. "I cannot preach a sermon nor prepare one according to art," says the man who had command of language, as no other. "I am an enemy to all those," he further says, "who conform themselves to the great learned folks, and not to the common people." "Accursed and again accursed are all preachers who in their churches reach after high, hard, subtle things and present them and preach of them to the people. When I preach here, I bring myself down as low as possible, don't concern myself about doctors and professors, who number forty odd, but look to the multitudes of young people, children and servants, who are present by hundreds or thousands. I preach to them; to them I accommodate myself: they have need of it." "This is a common fault among all preachers: they preach in such a fashion that the poor multitude learns very little". Luther is a model of simplicity. His heart was not trammeled by the laws of the schools and lifted him out of the confines of the intellectual

method: his first object was to preach for the heart and not for the ear; in this he was in full accord with Augustine, who said: it is better for the grammarians to scold us than for the congregation not to understand us. He does not hear, who has not understood (non audit, qui non intellexit).

That simplicity does not exclude depth and heartiness, multitudinous arguments prove. Spangenberg, who praises simplicity with the words: holy simplicity, wonder of grace, deepest wisdom, greatest power, most beautiful adornment, origin of love, work, created by God alone—preached with exceeding plainness and yet so moved the heart that a gifted orator from England after hearing a sermon preached by the man of God on Good Friday, confessed: "Ah, how this plain discourse surpasses my great words and wisdom!" Dr. Nägelsbach, author of the homeric theology, relates of the reformed preacher and professor Krafft: "How we were stirred when Krafft in the simplest manner, as before catechumens, but with the majesty and dignity of a witness for Christ, declared the fundamental truths of salvation and especially the grace of God and the love of the Savior in the atonement! From that hour I became a Christian and understood the gospel."

He who preaches so that the congregation understands him, preaches popularly. "The true popularity of spiritual discourse presents," says Löber, "as the Holy Scriptures present, suitable nourishment for the most various degrees of culture and life. God's thoughts clothe themselves in the children's language and still remain elevated high as the heavens are above the earth. We can learn from the Holy Scriptures the art of plain speaking as well as the art of accommodating ourselves to our hearers. The two must be combined.—Of course the truly popular discourse, to be so in truth, must appeal to all grades of life and culture, not only to the *populus*, but to the *Senatus populusque* (high and low). But highly cultured people feel more interested in simple discourse, bearing the stamp of directness, than through well calculated and intricate thoughts. Eminent simplicity, which meets the wants of all, is only the product of the greatest labor and of energetic penetration into the essence of things."

§29. THE FRANKNESS OF THE SERMON.

"Ye that love the Lord, hate evil!" (Ps. 97, 10.) Holy love shares God's antipathies. Frank polemics against the evil, which is rebellion against the Lord, and yields him who practices it bitter fruits only, is a duty of love to God and to the brethren. And such frankness should be esteemed. As Luther says, the truth and God's Word should be taught and preached without reserve, plain and pure, no half and half, nor with the addition of a waxen nose. But let the preacher take heed that he do not separate "speaking the truth" from "love!" Even the heathen, Cicero, has given the counsel: Let your admonition be without bitterness! And Erasmus says: Let the minister's reproof be as though charity, not anger, spoke. Odious bluster, offensiveness, invective, satire embitter. "The servant of the Lord must not strive" is Paul's pastoral rule (2 Tim. 2, 24.) He does not plead for that sapless, feeble love which ventures only to touch the Old Adam with a soft brush. This evil nature should rather be attacked with all earnestness and energy and continually combatted, as we learn from Paul's admonition to Titus (2, 15): "Exhort and rebuke with all authority!" He who rightly takes this word to heart will not be worried with the anxious care that, by bearing candid testimony against prevailing sins, he might give offence and destroy his influence among the people.

Woe to the preacher who only desires that the people be satisfied with him and who is afraid to make them dissatisfied with himself. Alas, fear stops many a mouth. But is not such fear the mark of a hireling, who flees from the wolf? Does not Augustine's sentence hit such a character: thou didst flee because thou wast silent; thou wast silent because thou didst fear; fear of mind is flight? "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel. . . . When I say unto the wicked, thou shalt surely die; and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand" (Ezekiel 3, 17. 18.) Every preacher should inscribe this word with an iron pen upon the table of his heart. One can preach the truth of the Bible correctly, and yet come short of the candor that is here enjoined. This was the case

with Urlsperger for a time, while he was court-preacher to the frivolous Elector Charles in Stuttgart. A. H. Francke, when on a visit to him, reminded him of this: "I hear, brother, that thy sermons are evangelical, but thou dost not touch upon the sins of thy court in a single word. I therefore come, in the name of my God, to tell thee that thou art a dumb dog (Is. 56, 10) and if thou dost not turn and as a public teacher freely speak the truth, thou wilt be lost in spite of all thy learning." Francke took a sorrowful leave. But Urlsperger took the word to heart, and would rather lose his office, if that were the result of the frankness which he used from that time on, than lose his soul.

The instructions given by the Lord to His servant: "Speak, and hold not thy peace;" "them that sin, rebuke!"— drove an Ambrosius to admonish the blood-stained and passionate emperor, Theodosius the Great, to imitate King David in penitence as he had already imitated him in sin; and these same words moved a Calvin to oppose with the Sword of the Spirit the godless doings of the Libertines in Geneva, though it endangered his own life; and a Hedinger was moved to stop his elector on the way of sin with the words: "If your highness can be served with a little blood, just go ahead, I do not fear death;" and a Massillon was prompted, in his funeral oration over Louis XIV. to mention that monarch's offences against conjugal fidelity. There was a saying among the ancient Spartans: those who drink out of the Eurotas know no fear. Still less do they know fear who drink of the waters of Siloah.

Flesh and blood, cowardice and weakness, often counsel us to wait for the times and circumstances that are more favorable for rebuking current sins and vices. But "while Rome deliberates, Saguntum falls." On the morrow the time of grace will perhaps have expired for the soul, which to-day could yet be won through frank warning and admonition. Altogether different from those cowardly words sounds the advice of Paul: "In season, out of season!" Place on the pastoral memorandum 2 Tim. 4, 2.

If the preacher has to rebuke sin, to preach repentance, he dare not hunt around for pretty words; the plain word of truth, which goes straight to the conscience, is alone in place. "One dare not preach repentance beautifully." Of

course it is not meant that the filthy linen of the old man be hung out with disgusting immodesty, as was the practice of Zacharias Werner, of whom Barnhagan relates, that he pictured with zest and great satisfaction the pleasure of the world and the vile depths of godless lives, while the proud world was carried away with delight at finding such "high taste" displayed in the sermon and at having such an intoxicant for the senses. Unchaste language in rebuking sin only increases the evil treasure of the heart. "The wisdom that is from above is first pure" (James 3, 17.)

The preacher should also guard against morally annihilating persons. We owe them as individuals esteem. For how many a Malchus has the unreasonable zeal of a Peter cut off an ear, that by a gentle Barnabas could have been opened for the Word of Truth.

If the preacher has to denounce certain events of the times, he ought not forget the good that is in them. After a fair and honest recognition of the fragments of truth which are intermingled with error, the combatting of that error will more easily obtain a hearing.

Mere thundering against errors and sins accomplishes nothing. Reproof and exhortation should, according to the apostolic injunction 2 Tim. 4, 2. be accompanied by instruction. "Those who have so much of vehemence and bitterness," says Calvin, "are not well buttressed with sound doctrine, quickly expend themselves, make a great noise, raise a tumult without profiting any one, because they build without a foundation." One ought not only rebuke sin, one must in a didactic way point out the sad results, the curse, of sin, and then show the way in which the hurts of sin may be healed.

We have already intimated that the preacher dare not overstep the boundaries of frankness. Coarseness is nowhere recommended in the Scriptures as a charism. The delicate, polished steel works better than the raw iron. What is allowed for an aged, hoary, experienced and approved servant of Christ to speak, is not likewise permissible to a youth in years, a neophyte in Christianity and the office. "A reverend man of distinguished authority and experienced as a speaker, presents many truths which penetrate to the hearts of his hearers, but, spoken by a younger

man, would excite laughter," remarks the old Lutheran writer on Pastoral theology, Balduin. 1 Tim. 5, 1. cannot be too carefully considered by young preachers. An able theologian of our day has somewhere made the remark "that the young men, who are least equipped in theology, are the ones who display an unheard of plainness in the pulpit in castigating sin; if they come down from Mt. Sinai, it is in truth not necessary to cover their face with a veil on account of the overpowering and judicial splendor."

True frankness must grow in the soil of humility. "The Lord's servants, who are to preach the gospel of the kingdom of God, must bear the Sword of the Spirit, they dare not spare the bolts against Babylon, but they must inwardly wear the garments of penitence." The most prominent servants of the Lord did not appear with arrogance and self-importance, but in humility, modesty, almost backwardness. Paul came "in fear, and in much trembling" (1 Cor. 2, 3). Luther says of himself: "Although I am now an old and experienced preacher, yet I tremble when I have to preach."

We have mentioned before how Origen, when he was to preach on Ps. 50, 16 and 17, felt himself so deeply humbled that he could not refrain from weeping before the congregation. Have we less reason than Origen for such thorough humiliation? He who heartily abases himself before God, executes the Lord's commission to men with modesty. The old writers on pastoral theology could not commend enough to preachers the virtue of modesty. To a self-conceited appearance with the gushing feeling of a freethinker, to pride, no blessing is promised.

"God giveth grace to the humble!"

§ 30. POLEMICS IN THE SERMON.

There is incumbent on Christ's servant the two-fold duty of instructing in the truth and refuting that which is contradictory to the truth (1 Tim. 1, 3); he should use the trowel and the sword (Neh. 4, 7. 23)—but only "the sword of of the Spirit," not the sword of Peter.

The sword must be employed differently accordingly as it is wielded against the seducer or against the seduced. How many follow the banner of error only out of weakness

in knowledge or from want of clearness. If no impure motive is connected with their error, it is so much the more duty to have polemics in this instance under the control of love. In general, polemics should not degenerate into passionate bluster or make the impression that the congregation must be forced into the truth. "It is peculiar to the fear of God not to compel but to convince," says Athanasius. The congregation must be brought with considerateness and love to the consciousness of her loss if she exchange the sound doctrine for the teachings of those who speak lies. (1 Tim. 4, 2). If the congregation receives the impression that the preacher pursues no selfish ends in his polemics, and if she gains the insight that it concerns here the custody of an entrusted treasure and the observation of "the doctrine which is according to godliness" (1 Tim. 6, 3), then will the pastor stand before her fully approved as a "faithful steward," and none will be able to deny him the testimony that Augustine bore respecting Cyprian: "the peace-loving." But polemics ought not permeate every sermon: It would be a mistake if the preacher thought himself under the necessity, on each presentation of the truth, of entering upon a discussion of the antithesis of heresy and unbelief. The truth confirms itself, "without, like the cactus, always turning its thorns outward;" it attests itself to man through its internal harmony, not only in his intellect or heart, but in his whole inner life. What Löber says of excess in polemics is worthy of notice: "The Christians of the post-apostolic period made the greatest conquests and won the most important victories, not by polemics, but by sinking themselves into and becoming unbrokenly absorbed in the inner life of God; in their service they were so reserved and cautious in communicating the mysteries of faith, the tendency of their whole life was so earnest, that the observant heathen felt themselves transplanted, not into the arena of wrangling Sophists, but into holy ground. On the other hand, the polemical sermons of later times, because they possessed no unction, could not communicate moral unction to the Christian people."

THE SABBATH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY REV. P. A. PETER, WEST BALTIMORE, OHIO.

The *sedes doctrinae* in the New Testament that treats expressly of the Sabbath, is Col. 2, 16. 17. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ. According to this passage, sabbath days, as well as all other ordinances of the ceremonial law, such as meats and drinks, holy days and new moons, were simply shadows of things yet in the future, that is, faint and imperfect figures or representations of better things to come, or indistinct images or types of future realities in the kingdom of God. The law was a shadow of good things to come, but not the very image of the things. Heb. 10, 1 Luther translates "substance," not "image." Christ is the body, the substance, of which the ceremonial law was the shadow. Olshausen says, "As a body is prefigured by its shadow, so the Old Testament is a silhoutte of the new, a symbolic representation and type of Christ and of His work and Church." Dächsel says, "Since Christ has appeared, the sun of divine revelation no longer stands behind us as it did to the members of the old covenant, to whom the shadow went before, to indicate that something was following after, but this sun is now before us, and the body throws its shadow behind, that we may perceive what was meant by the prophecies and ordinances of the Old Testament." The whole ceremonial order of services with its meats, and drinks, and days, and places, and observances, was the example and shadow of heavenly things. Heb. 8, 5. The ceremonial law, to which the sabbath belonged, together with all other levitical ordinances, has been abrogated, annulled and cancelled by the perfect obedience of Christ, who came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfill (Matt. 5, 17). But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons (Gal. 4, 4. 5).

Our Lord Jesus Christ not only perfectly obeyed in our stead all the commandments of the moral law, but also all the ordinances of the ceremonial law. He also kept the sabbath, for it became Him to fulfill all righteousness (Matt. 3, 15).

In Col. 2, 14, the Apostle affirms, that Christ blotted out (erased, obliterated), the handwriting of ordinances (the bond written in ordinances. Rev. Version—the law of commandments contained in ordinances, Eph. 2, 15), which handwriting or bond was against us or contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross. The ceremonial law was a burden, a yoke, which according to Peter, neither the disciples of Christ nor their fathers were able to bear (Acts 15, 10). Christ removed that heavy yoke when He blotted out the handwriting of the ceremonial ordinances, took it out of the way and nailed it to His cross. Whilst the handwriting of levitical ordinances was a grievous burden to the Jews, it was at the same time a wall of partition to the Gentiles. But Christ has removed that wall of separation. For He is our peace, who hath made both (believing Jews and believing Gentiles), one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances: for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace, etc. (Eph. 2, 14. 15).

Christ having abrogated the ceremonial ordinances, no one is under any obligation to observe them. This is just as true of the sabbath days as of meats and drinks, holy days and new moons. Our Lord, having conquered all the infernal powers, made a show of them openly and triumphing over them, has made us free indeed (John 8, 36) not only from the condemnation of the moral law, but also from the commandments or ordinances of men with which they would bind our consciences concerning sabbath days, or any particular days or times, as necessary under the new dispensation. Not only are Christians not bound to observe the seventh day sabbath of the old dispensation, but more than that: they are not bound by divine command to observe any particular day as a day of rest and public worship. The Augsburg Confession, (Art. 28) says that "the holy Scripture has abolished the sabbath," and "that

neither the observance of the sabbath, nor of any other day, is indispensable."

Men have just as little right to institute ordinances and bind them upon men's consciences, as if they were divine commands, concerning the observance of any day for public worship, as they have a right to command what they must, or must not eat and drink. How can the Sabbatarian bind the observance of the seventh day upon men's consciences, when Christ has abrogated the sabbath? How can the Puritan bind the keeping of the first day of the week upon the consciences of Christians by assuming that that day was instituted and ordained as the sabbath of the new dispensation, by order of the Apostles? The Sabbatarian returns to the bondage of the old covenant, whilst the Puritan turns the liberty of the new covenant into bondage (Gal. 5, 1). Christianity is not legalism. The Augsburg Confession says (Art. 28), "Again, they who institute human traditions, act contrary to the command of God, by ascribing sins to meats, to days, and the like things, and by thus encumbering Christendom with the servitude of the law, as though there had to be among Christians, to merit the grace of God, such a divine service as the levitical, and as if he had commanded the apostles and bishops to establish it, as some writers testify." Again the Augsburg Confession says (Art. 28), "There are many unwarrantable disputations relative to the change of the law, to the ceremonies of the New Testament, to the alteration of the sabbath; all of which have sprung from the false and erroneous opinion, that there must be in the Christian Church a divine service corresponding with the levitical or Jewish service of God, and that Christ had commanded the apostles and bishops to devise new ceremonies, which should be necessary to salvation. These errors obtained in Christendom when the righteousness of faith was not clearly and purely taught and preached. Some also argue, that Sunday must be kept, although not from divine authority, prescribing in what form and to what degree labor may be performed on that day. But what else are such disputations, but snares of conscience? For although they presume to modify and mitigate human traditions, yet no mitigation can be attained, so long as the opinion exists

and continues, that they are necessary. Now this opinion must continue, if men know nothing of the righteousness of faith, and of Christian liberty."

Another very important passage with reference to the sabbath question is Gal. 4, 9. 10. 11. Here the Apostle earnestly reproves the Galatian Christians for turning to the weak and beggarly elements, the ordinances of the ceremonial law, observing the Jewish sabbath, the new moons, festivals and sabbatical years of the old dispensation. The Apostle feared that his labor in preaching the Gospel had been bestowed upon them in vain. In Col. 2, 16. 17 the Apostle shows that the sabbath was abrogated. Here he shows how important it is for Christians to realize this truth. The Galatians had obtained the true knowledge of God and of His will and purpose toward fallen man through the faithful preaching of St. Paul. For a while they rejoiced in the glorious liberty of the Gospel and made good progress in the Christian life. Then judaizing teachers, false brethren, came among them and taught the necessity of circumcision. They were soon led away from the Gospel Paul had preached unto them, to another gospel. They had begun in the Spirit and now sought perfection in the flesh. They had been called to enjoy the liberty Christ brought them and now sought to be put under the yoke of ceremonial bondage. The Apostle tells them that if they submit to circumcision, Christ should profit them nothing, that they would be obliged to observe the whole law, that Christ would be of no effect unto them if they were circumcised, and that they had fallen from grace.

Christ fulfilled the ceremonial law and abrogated it; why then should believers turn to the weak and beggarly elements (rudiments, Rev. Ver.—external ordinances, Luther), and be under bondage? What a folly for the Galatian Christians, who as Gentiles had never been under subjection to the ceremonial law, to turn to it after its abrogation! What folly to turn to judaizing teachers, who sought to enslave their consciences, when the Gospel had made them free indeed! Why should these Gentile Christians observe the obsolete Jewish ceremonial distinctions of meats and drinks, days and months, times and years, forms and ceremonies, as if their salvation depended upon

these observances? Why should these believers, who ought to have rejoiced in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, now seek for that handwriting of ordinances, that the Lord took out of the way and nailed to His cross, and become subject to it?

We may well suppose that a great sorrow filled the Apostle's heart, when he wrote to the deluded Galatian Christians, "Ye observe days and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." "Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?" We may picture to our minds his holy indignation against the false brethren, the judaizing teachers when he writes, "I would they were even cut off which trouble you." There is an awful danger in following legalistic tendencies. The difference between the law and the Gospel is imperceptibly obliterated, until the latter is made a set of external ordinances. The grand, fundamental doctrine of justification by faith alone is darkened more and more, until at last men-made forms of work-righteousness take its place. A formal, narrow, contracted view of Christianity is adopted by the legalist, instead of the broad, joyful, cheerful view taken by him who is not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Alas! how many professing Christ and His Gospel, begin in the Spirit and then seek to be made perfect by the flesh! The surrender of Christian liberty, the liberty of the Gospel, must lead to a denial of the Gospel. By their circumcision the Jews obligated themselves to yield obedience to the ceremonial law. By their baptism Christians profess allegiance to Christ and obligate themselves to observe the institutions He has given to His Church. How then can Christians be under obligation to observe the ordinances of the ceremonial law, to which they owe no allegiance? How can they turn to the weak and beggarly elements or rudiments of the ceremonial law and consider the observance of the Sabbath or Sunday as absolutely necessary? We again say with the Augsburg Confession (Art. 28), "Those, then, who are of opinion, that such institution of Sunday instead of the Sabbath, was established as a thing necessary, err very much. For the holy Scripture has abolished the

Sabbath, and it teaches that all ceremonies of the old law, since the revelation of the Gospel, may be discontinued."

A third very important passage concerning distinction of days, is Rom. 14, 5. 6. It is evident from this passage that such a distinction is an *adiaphoron.* If it were not, the Apostle could not say, He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. Concerning *adiaphora* or things indifferent, the F. C. (Decl. Art. 10), says, "Thus Paul yields and gives place to the weak in faith, in meat, and times, or days, Rom. 14, 6. But to the false apostles, who wish to observe these observances upon the conscience, *as necessary things,* he will not yield, even in things which are discretionary and indifferent in themselves: Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day. Col. 2, 16. And when in such a case, Peter and Barnabas yielded to some extent, Paul openly rebuked them as those who walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the Gospel, Gal. 2, 14." With respect to things indifferent Christians should hold fast to the principle of evangelical liberty, expressed by St. Paul in Gal. 5, 5: Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. To those who would spy out (Gr. ensnare us in our liberty), we should not sumbit, but assert our freedom from ceremonial ordinances, that the truth of the Gospel may be kept in its purity (see Gal. 2, 4. 5). The Epitome of the Tenth Art. F. C. says that "if a clear and firm confession of faith is required from us, we are not to yield to the enemies of the Gospel in these indifferent things." No one has a right to judge Christians in an *adiapharon.* Rom. 14, 4.

The passages cited above are the most important in the New Testament on the doctrine concerning the keeping of Sabbath and Sunday. By carefully examining these passages, we come to the conclusion that Christians are under no moral obligation based upon a divine command to observe the first or the seventh or any other particular day, as of divine appointment, as a day of rest and public worship. Yet it is necessary that Christians should meet in public at stated times to hear the Word of God and preaching, which is a moral duty. Hence from the earliest

times of the Christian Church, the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, has been observed as a day of public worship. The Augsburg Confession (Art. 28), says, "And yet as it was necessary to appoint a certain day, so that the people might know when they should assemble, the Christian Church ordained Sunday for that purpose, and possessed rather more inclination and willingness for this alteration, in order that the people might have an example of Christian liberty, that they might know that neither the observance of the Sabbath, nor of any other day is indispensable."

Such passages as Acts 20, 7; 1 Cor. 16, 2, and Rev. 1, 9, indicate, that the first day of the week was observed in the days of the Apostles, as a day set apart for public worship, holy contemplation and the laying in store at home of individual gifts for charitable purposes. But these passages do not prove, that the observance of the first day of the week was based upon a positive command, either of the Lord or His apostles. There have been many unfruitful disputations concerning the change of the seventh day Sabbath to the first day of the week. All these useless controversies have arisen from legalistic conceptions of Christianity. The Church of Rome attributes to the Church or rather to the clergy the power to make laws concerning meats, holidays, festivals, etc. The Augsburg Confession says (Art. 28): "Further, it is questionable, whether bishops have power also to establish in the Church, ceremonies, such as ordinances concerning meats, holidays, and concerning different orders of ministers. Those who attribute this power to bishops, cite the declaration of Christ, John 16, 12. 13: I have yet many things to say to you, but ye cannot hear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth. In addition they introduce the example Acts 15, 20, where they have forbidden 'things strangled and blood.' So it is alleged also, that the Sabbath was changed into Sunday, contrary to the Ten Commandments, as they regard it, and no example is urged and alleged more strenuously, than the change of the Sabbath; and they wish to maintain by that, that the power of the Church is great, since it has dispensed

with a precept of the Ten Commandments, and has effected some change in them."

Legalism lies at the bottom of the Sabbatarian, the Roman Catholic and the Puritan conception of the Sabbath. From the earliest times there were judaizing sects, such as the Ebionites, Nazarenes, Elkesaites and others, who observed the seventh day sabbath, as well as the other ordinances of the ceremonial law. The Roman Catholic conception of Sunday is positively legalistic. To observe that day is commanded by a "law" of the Church, and this "law" is based on the erroneous idea "that there must be in the Church a divine service corresponding with the levitical or Jewish service of God, and that Christ had commanded the Apostles and Bishops to devise new ceremonies, which should be necessary to salvation." Augs. Conf. Art. 28. The Puritanic conception of Sunday is based upon an idea, first expressed by Dr. Nicholas Bownde in 1595 that the sabbath-day was changed from Saturday to Sunday by authority of the Apostles, acting under divine direction,—a view essentially the same as that of the Roman Catholic Church.

Over against all legalistic conceptions with respect to the Sabbath, the Lutheran Church says with the great Apostle: And where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. 2 Cor. 3, 17. Let us not forget the apostolic admonition: Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men. 1 Cor. 7, 23.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. XVI. OCTOBER, 1896. No. 5.

THE GRACE OF GIVING.

BY REV. PROF. M. LOY, D.D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

So many schemes have been devised to replenish the treasuries of the church, and so much time and labor have been spent in operating them, that the simple method of Scripture, first to make the tree good and then to cultivate it and gather its fruits, is gradually becoming obsolete. We are getting so busy in running to and fro to keep the Lord's work moving by dint of our inventions, that there is little time and often little inclination left to make patient use of the means by which the Lord Himself does His work and does it effectually, though perhaps not as rapidly as our hurrying age may desire. Giving, like all other good works, is a grace. There is an imitation of this grace when men are induced to give to the support of the church from other motives than the love of Christ and the desire to bring to all men the great salvation which He has wrought. But that is not what the Christian Church in the name of her Lord is called or concerned to produce. So far as she would make the mere giving her aim, and consider her work done in the individual, even so far as giving is concerned, when she has managed to get his money, she is not faithful to her commission.

We will not here enter upon the question whether the church should accept money at all, when it is offered with the distinct understanding that the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ has nothing to do with the contribution. But we

cannot refrain from declaring that we are not in harmony with those who think that the Christian Church is reduced to beggary, and that if the world and the flesh do not help her she would die.

The church has higher work than that of getting money, necessary as this is, in her earthly state, to carry on her work. Every effort to get money for this work by urging other motives than those of the love of Christ, so far as the result would be contributions under the impression that such work would please God and count on the judgment day, is a hindrance to the accomplishment of her great object. Her aim must be to proclaim the grace of God which bringeth salvation, and thus secure cheerful givers, whose contributions shall glorify the Lord their Savior and shall carry with them His blessing for the good of men.

But when the grace of God has done its regenerating work there still remain difficulties in the way of securing the money necessary to execute the Lord's will on earth. When men through the faithful application of the means of grace have been brought to believe, the principal thing has indeed been accomplished that is necessary not only for salvation, but for every good work. And yet every problem in regard to giving is not thus immediately solved, as all pastors have occasion to experience. We are often disappointed in the amount contributed by those whom we have reason to recognize as Christian believers, and therefore as brethren in the church. Sometimes we are very agreeably disappointed, as members give much more than, in our estimation, their circumstances warrant; but generally our disappointment is on the other side, as members commonly give less, often much less, than our knowledge of their circumstances would lead us to expect.

No doubt in both cases we are frequently in the wrong. We may expect more or less than is meet, we may inwardly condemn without ground. Let us, as much as lieth in us, guard against doing any wrong to a brother. The pastor's expectation might be fully justified in view of the known power of faith to work by love, and in view of the known amount of property held by the person in question. Perhaps if such pastor were in the same circumstances he

would act in the same way, notwithstanding his disappointment and his consequent sorow, or even contempt. There may be disabilities which he does not see, and for which he may even in a large measure be himself responsible. In his well-meant zeal he may have overlooked the difference between babes and full-grown men in Christ, and expected as much of one as of the other, judging all by the same measure. And he may, in his eagerness to raise money, have failed to apply the Word to individual conditions, and thus have withheld the water from the plants. Giving is a grace, and the same means which are necessary to make cheerful givers must be constantly applied to promote growth in this, as in every other grace. Let there be no interference with the free operations of the love by which faith works; let there be no attempts at coercion; let there be no evasion of the will of God: but let the word of grace that makes willing hearts and shows the way to please God be diligently applied. Then "every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver. And God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work." 2 Cor. 9, 7. 8.

While it is thus apparent that the only way effectually to meet the financial requirements of the church is to ply the Word of God, which imparts grace and guides the believing heart in the exercise of the grace bestowed, there are still weighty problems to be solved. They confront those who are to teach the will of God, as well as those who are to execute that will by cheerful giving.

That every member of the Church should contribute, according as the Lord has prospered him, towards its support, is generally conceded. But some have found their way into the external congregation who give nothing, or only so much as seems to them necessary to keep up appearances, which is next to nothing. Some give nothing because they are too poor, having difficulty even to procure the necessaries of life, and to avoid becoming themselves objects of charity. Some, even if they are able and willing to give, are too ignorant to perceive that the work of the church necessarily costs money, or to know where

money is needed, or how, if a need is known, a contribution would reach the proper object and afford relief. And even the more intelligent and liberal are often in doubt how much they should give.

As regards the poor who confess their inability to contribute, the church, in its Christian love, by the grace which is given it, should always be willing to help them, not ask them to help the church. There may be some who pretend poverty, that their avarice may make an honorable escape from the burden of giving. That is deplorable. But the church is not responsible for the hypocrites who infest the congregations and, because it cannot see into men's hearts, has no means of ridding herself of such pests. Only when they become manifest can she do anything with them by way of discipline. Nor are people so likely to beg exemption on the ground of poverty from the duty of giving, when the evidence of their ability is plain to all who know their circumstances. Mostly men of means would rather seek some other excuse for not giving than that of poverty. Those who are so stupid as to urge a reason which all have the opportunity to know as futile, and even ridiculous, are comparatively few. When men who are solicited to give, plead poverty and make the confession, which nature is not in haste to make, that they have barely enough to live, and have not a dime that could be spared without actual suffering, the church has not the heart to press its needs, but is disposed rather to offer its help when this shall be deemed necessary to keep the wolf from the door.

It is otherwise with those who will not give because they renounce the obligation, or decline to comply with it while they recognize it. Faith works by love. The believer in Christ, as soon as he learns the Lord's will, is ready, according to his ability, to execute it. Those who know their duty, but do not feel the obligation which the Word lays upon them, are certainly not Christians. They have not known Christ as their Savior, and do not own Him as their Lord. If they truly believed in Him as their Redeemer and their Lord, they would heed the Word, and His Spirit would move them to do His will, which is expressed in His Word. One who has no spiritual power

that prompts him to help forward the blessed work of the church, and to make sacrifices in its interest, because it is needful for the salvation of souls, and who, when the will of the Lord which requires the work as necessary is declared, will not recognize the authority of that will and, subjecting himself to it, bring forth fruits meet for repentance, has no claim to be further considered a member of the communion of saints. He should be excluded from the Christian congregation, not on the ground that he contributes nothing, which might result from misfortune and inability eliciting sympathy rather than censure, but because he has become manifest as an impenitent sinner. The effort to justify the retention of such covetous persons in the congregation, on the ground that their expulsion would make trouble and even still further interfere with the financial success of the work in which it is engaged, is only a rationalistic expedient that sets aside the will of the Lord. Such counsels of human wisdom, which are stupidly supposed to be superior to divine ordinances, and which, if not rebelliously, at least ignorantly, pursue the ways of the flesh, as against the ways of the Spirit, can issue only in death. If a member of the congregation will not do the Lord's will, when he knows it, but openly declares his purpose to do as he pleases, notwithstanding such knowledge, he makes manifest to those who are associated with him in a Christian brotherhood under the one Lord, who has redeemed us all, and the one Father who has accepted us all in the one Redeemer, that he is not of us, and those who thenceforward recognize him as one of the communion of saints, notwithstanding his persistence in his rejection of God's authority and his refusal to have the Lord reign over him, are partakers of his sin, whatever their special motives may be for their error.

But how is it with those who, while they professedly recognize the authority of God's Word, still fail in discharging the duty which it imposes in regard to giving? Unquestionably the Lord has given His people money enough to carry on His work effectually. The plea of poverty and consequent inability to give is valid in regard to some individuals, but could not be admitted in the aggregate. The church would not suffer for want of funds if its members

were faithful in their stewardship. Nor can it be said that the whole difficulty is solved by reference to the large proportion of persons in the congregations who are not truly Christians. Every pastor knows that many who fall short of meeting the obligations resting on them in regard to giving cannot, without uncharitableness or even injustice, be regarded as hypocrites, who have a name to live, but are dead. The mere fact that a person does not contribute when and as much as it seems to others that he should, does not even prove that he sins, much less that his profession of faith is a mere pretence. There may be circumstances unknown to others which prevent even devoted and conscientious Christians from giving on some occasions when their contributions are solicited. But making due allowance for all these hindrances, the fact is still plain that the church suffers because Christians do not give as they should. There is sin in the case, and sin that operates most injuriously upon the work of the church.

It is viewing the matter charitably when we attribute this largely to ignorance. The will of the Lord is not renounced, but it is not sufficiently known. That implies that the Bible, in which the will of the Lord is plainly set forth, is not studied by Christians generally as it should be. But in our estimation it implies something more. The teachers do not exert themselves enough to bring the will of the Lord clearly to the knowledge of the people. No doubt many would do better if they knew better.

Christian duty in regard to giving is not in itself so plain to man's common sense that careful effort to teach it is superfluous. So far is this from being the case that the natural man refuses to recognize the will of our Lord in regard to the use of our property. Even some Christian teachers hesitate to accept the truth, with all its consequences, that we are created in God's image that we might serve Him in righteousness, and that when sin and death came into the world and we were rendered slaves of the devil, He redeemed us that we might be rescued from the miserable servitude of sin and restored to His service in righteousness. But it is most certainly true. "He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them, and rose

again." 2 Cor. 5, 15. Hence the admonition is given, "Ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's." 1 Cor. 6, 20. "He that is called, being free, is Christ's servant. Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men." 1 Cor. 7, 22. 23. The Christian is a freeman of Christ and is liberated from all servitude not only to Satan and to sin, but to every creature. For all creatures are subject with him to their Creator, and therefore no created being or attribute of a created being can lord it over him: he is the Lord's freeman and subject to the Lord alone. But to Him he is subject; if he renounces his subjection he falls into the slavery of sin and death and the devil, though he may do this under the strong delusion that he is now emancipated from all power and authority over him. By faith the Christian embraces the redemption which is in Christ Jesus and becomes free from all slavery by entering into the glorious liberty of the children of God. But they have this liberty in virtue of their becoming Christ's. That means that they renounce all self-will and submit all their thoughts and volitions to His good and gracious will and use all their gifts in His blessed service, which gives them peace on earth and glory in heaven. In their walk and work on earth they are therefore stewards of their Lord. They have not a power and not a dollar which is not the Lord's; which is not to be used in the Lord's service, and for which they must not render account to the Lord who committed it to their trust. It is not so easy to get people who still have flesh and blood, and are so largely influenced by their carnal nature, to understand that, while as against their neighbors they are owners of property, as against God they are owners of nothing, and that if they are truly His by faith they must hold all that they have subject to His orders, and depend wholly on Him for their daily bread, as well as for their eternal glory. If they once understand this, they will also understand the danger of riches and the warnings against making them an object of their efforts; the sinfulness of depending on their temporal possessions as a provision for to-morrow and all time to come, instead of depending on the living God, who alone provides for us and without our merit or care bestows on us our daily bread;

and the wickedness of murmuring against the good Lord and rebelling against His will when He wants the money, entrusted to our stewardship subject to His orders, for the prosecution of His work in the church. Let the people have more light concerning the will of God in this respect. This cannot fail to lead those who by His grace are resolved to do His will, according to the ability which He has bestowed, to contribute more liberally to the support of the church in its glorious work of bringing the gospel of salvation to the souls of men, while it will make manifest those who will not have Christ to reign over them, and who will therefore go out from us, or be put out from us, because they are not of us.

But even when the principle is made clear, there are still difficulties in the application. The Lord does not prescribe how much of the goods which He has bestowed shall be devoted to one and how much to another of those various objects and ends which lie within the scope of His will. Money is needed to procure the necessaries of life and to support the family which is dependent upon us. Money is necessary to help our neighbors whose misfortune or distress commends them to our charity. And another thing, which complicates the subject and presents the greatest difficulty, must be taken into account. Money is needed for our comfort and for our cheer. The latter cannot summarily be ruled out, as some suppose. No doubt the whole question would be simplified if this point could be relegated to the category of works of the flesh, which run counter to all righteousness, and which all righteousness condemns. But it cannot be thus simplified. Of course those whose principle it is to live for the enjoyment of life would not agree that their very principle is carnal and can produce nothing but sin. That, however, would be of small account in the main question. It is not reasonable to expect that those who are condemned will be found in harmony with the law that condemns them. There are more serious difficulties than these. A very large proportion even of those who are spiritual protest against any ruling which condemns as carnal every enjoyment offered in the world, and therefore also against every effort to brand as sin the appropriation of any money to secure such enjoyments. And no

one who thinks soberly in the light of Scripture will blame them for the substance of their protest, even if they should regard the manner of framing it and presenting it as objectionable. It is easy to declare it a sin for a man to smoke a cigar or drink a glass of wine when the money which they cost is needed by the church to carry on its work of delivering human souls from the everlasting death. But the proof is by no means so easy. No doubt it is plain enough to most spiritually minded people that when one has only a dime and he spends it for a cigar or a glass of wine, while his family painfully needs it for bread, or his neighbor is dying for want of food, or the church is crippled in its work for want of funds, the spending of the dime for needless self-gratification is censurable. But if a person has provided for the wants of his family, and helped to relieve the distress of his neighbor which has come to his knowledge, and has made liberal contributions to the work of the church, and still has plenty left, how is it then if he smokes a cigar or drinks a glass of wine? A few might say that he has no right to gratify a desire for things that supply no actual want of body or soul, and that all which remains after his real wants are supplied should be devoted to the supply of actual wants in our neighbors and in the work of the church, which is endeavoring to supply men's most crying needs. There is plausibility in their view, and in our estimation no contemptuous sneer with which it is so often met answers their contention or satisfies the believing heart. God's will is to be done, and He has created us and redeemed us to this end. This is beyond all controversy in the minds of true believers. All that I am and all that I have is God's, and so far as in the creative plan of God I am endowed with a will, and as in His redemptive plan that will is brought into the original state of submission to His will, I can recognize no rule or law but that which He has revealed in His Word as His holy will. I have no business on earth but that of doing His will with all the powers and possessions which He has bestowed, and which He has bestowed for this purpose alone. There is therefore a semblance of reason and right in the argument of those who claim that, because all that we have belongs to the Lord, we have no right to use any part of it for the

gratification of any desires which seem to accomplish no purpose but that of giving us pleasure.

We will not urge against this specious theory that it lacks consistency in its application to human life on earth. It manifestly lies open to that objection. If a man may not smoke a cigar or drink a glass of wine because these are not necessary for the support of life, and the money which they cost is needed for the supply of real bodily or spiritual needs in others, neither may he eat anything or wear anything or furnish his house with anything that runs beyond the necessaries for the support of life, and that therefore costs money which is needlessly expended upon self while it was needed for the good of others. Why should we waste money on butter and coffee, when dry bread and water will sustain life just as well? Why should we spend our money for pies and cakes and puddings, when a plain potato will answer any legitimate purpose and probably prove much more conducive to health? Why should we have curtains for our windows and carpets for our floors and cushions for our chairs, when on the whole we would be better off without them? Why should we have pictures and statuary to decorate our homes, when it is manifest to all that we could live without them, and millions of our fellow-men do live without them? Why should we build houses at all that require expensive furnishings to correspond to their sumptuous designs, instead of living, as men have lived and still live, in caves or humble structures of moss or logs? Why should not wives and mothers do their own housework and men attend to their own home establishments, instead of employing servants to do the work for them and relieve them of their burdens? Cigars and wine are not the only luxuries which could be dispensed with and that must be dispensed with, if the theory is to be consistently carried out, that no money is to be spent upon ourselves except for the bare necessaries of life. But we will not urge the inconsistency of those who, whether expressly or by implication, maintain such a theory, because it might be correct notwithstanding the shortcomings and failures of its advocates in applying it, although it certainly would be fair to insist that such advocates, if they wish to

be regarded as sincere, must either abandon their theory or practice it better.

But what we do urge against the view presented is that it does not accord with the teaching of Scripture. It does not set forth the will of the Lord whose stewards we are. It lays on us burdens which He has not imposed and deprives us of privileges which He has granted us. It does not set forth the divine economy. In appointing us stewards He has not limited us in appropriations for our own use to that which is indispensable for the support of life. That is not His order in the realm of nature or of grace. The flowers that delight the eye and the joy of singing birds are not absolutely necessary for man's existence: we could breathe and live without them. But it pleased the infinite goodness of God to make the earth beautiful and to make man capable of delight in its beauty. Is there sin in the appreciation of God's handiwork in nature, and in man's imperfect efforts to represent in art the ideals which they suggest? Is there sin in admiring a rose or a lily and enjoying their beautiful form and delightful fragrance, instead of expending all our admiration on the wheat and the water? Is it a sin to enjoy a poem and a picture, and not a sin to enjoy a beefsteak or a plum-pudding, because the former are needless and the latter may, though with much difficulty and many a lingering doubt, be regarded as necessary? God has made things for our enjoyment as well as for our sustenance. And when the grace of God announces and conveys its benefits and blessings to man, and bringeth salvation, it does not teach us to despise the lily and the rose, the picture and the poem, but to glorify God on this behalf, as it teaches us to glorify God for the wonders of redemption and regeneration. The wonderful plan of God in nature, and the more marvelous plan of God in grace, has been misunderstood, if it has not wholly been ignored, when in either case only rescue from wretchedness—in temporal things from starvation, in spiritual things from the curse of sin and death—is taken into account, and all the boundless beneficence of a loving Father, intent upon making His children happy, is disregarded, because happiness is not neceseary to keep us

from freezing or starving, or to exempt us from death and damnation.

God's plan is that of leading out of the misery of sin to the blessedness of holiness, in which man was first created, and which made his life in Eden an uninterrupted series of delights until Satan and sin entered the garden of bliss. When the Lord is recognized as over all, who supplies all the goods which we possess and to whom we must give account for the use of all that He has committed to our trust, the enjoyment of the divine bounties is not forbidden us. What is forbidden is the ignoring of the Lord of all, the fixing of our trust for the necessaries and comforts of life on the gift instead of the Giver, and the pride that usurps the authority of the Proprietor and renounces all accountability. "Charge them that are rich in this world that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate." 1 Tim. 6, 17. 18. The charge is not that they should give up their riches, as if these were a gift of the devil and not of God, and not that they should have no enjoyment of the good gifts of God's bounty, but that they should not trust in their riches, which are uncertain, and that they should use them for the benefit of their fellow-men as well as for their own enjoyment. If such a rich person smokes a cigar, or eats a shrimp salad, or drinks a cup of coffee or a glass of wine, all of which may be declared to lie outside of the absolute requisites to sustain life, does he violate the law of the loving God who has in His boundless goodness given us all things to enjoy? Let those who would pronounce such enjoyment sinful, give us some other authority for their judgment than that of their own reason or feeling, if they would have Christian people bow to their decrees.

The rich man violates the divine charge when he trusts in his riches. These are very uncertain, because God governs the world according to His wisdom and love, which are beyond our scrutiny, so that we cannot know who shall be the poor man or who shall be the rich man to-morrow, notwithstanding the appearances of to-day. When it pleases God a poor man becomes rich, and when it pleases

God a rich man becomes poor. There is no revelation that enables us to determine this, and nature, with all its data to estimate probabilities, cannot show it. Riches are very uncertain; they come and go in regard to individuals, as the wise providence of God appoints. To trust in them is therefore folly. But it is worse than that. To trust in them is idolatry. For it is God that gives us our daily bread and preserves our lives, and he who presumes that because God has given him wealth he no longer needs God, is a fool, who may not only come to want in a few days and certainly will come to want if God turns away from him as he turns away from God, but to whom the message may come before another morning dawns, "Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee."

But these solemn truths in no wise imply that for those who have become God's dear children there shall be no more cakes and ale. The things which God gives us to enjoy are not to be morosely rejected as if the sin that is in the world had made them all wicked and their bestowal were only a snare, or as if at the utmost they could be accepted for use only so far as this could be done without the least taint of enjoyment in their use. The plan of God involves no such moroseness. It seeks man's happiness in righteousness, whether God is pleased to give us much or little. He knoweth what is best for us and doeth all things well. The Christian is therefore content when he is poor, and envies not his neighbor who is rich, because the same loving God provides for both, and both are equally dependent on His bounty. But if God gives us enough to have butter for our bread and sugar for our coffee, and even enough to contribute liberally to the church and still have enough to share our bread with our needy neighbor, what law is there that would justify any one in bringing accusations against us if we gave him some butter with the bread, and if we gave him of our abundance not only some coffee and tea, but even some sugar for its greater enjoyment? "For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the Word of God and prayer." 1 Tim. 4, 4. 5.

There is no divine ordinance which gives specific directions to regulate individual action in regard to giving. It

does not accord with the plans which God has revealed to assume such regulations, or to devise them and impose them on God's people. The better Christians understand the ways of God and the more they are brought into harmony with these ways, the less are they inclined to submit to any human regulations when others attempt to bind them on their consciences as divine law. The more deeply they have been led into the mind of God as revealed in the Gospel, the more fully do they appreciate the grave import of the apostolic admonition: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage." Gal. 5, 1.

Christ has redeemed us from death and damnation, and made us free children of God by faith in His name. We are now no longer in servitude, but have been restored to the liberty and all the high privileges of children. "Before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Gal. 3, 23-26. We are therefore no longer under any law, so far as the Spirit of God has, by regenerating us, brought us into conformity with the will of our Lord, who has called us by the Gospel into His service, not as slaves who are by compulsion to do the work and bear the grievous burden laid upon us, but as children who have been brought to recognize the blessedness of the Lord's will and to delight in its execution as the means of glorifying Him and bringing happiness to those for whose deliverance from bondage He died and rose again. As free children of God we are under no law, because that which the divine law requires is our own free choice, and that which human ordinances would still impose upon us has no authority and no obligatoriness.

But it does not follow that we can do just as we please, whether we recognize the will of the Lord as our rule or not. We are free because we know no other rule but that will. "For ye are not under the law, but under grace. What then? Shall we sin because we are not un-

der the law, but under grace? God forbid. Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death or of obedience unto righteousness? But God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered unto you. Being then made free from sin ye became the servants of righteousness." Rom. 6, 14-18. Just because grace has rendered believers able to serve the living God with cheerfulness, they no longer need the constraints of the law to drive them into obedience, which, after all, under such circumstances, would not be the reality, but only the external appearance of righteousness.

For Christians there is no law to regulate their lives but that of love, by which their faith works. God bestows His gifts in various measure as it seems good in His sight. One receives more, another less. There is among men no equality of talents and powers, of condition and opportunity. It was not designed that there should be. Men always contravene the plan of God when they attempt to do away with all differences in position and possession. Even nature teaches that all such leveling schemes are foolish efforts to compass impossibilities. If by art or violence a condition of external equality were brought about to-day, there would be inequality again to-morrow. The gifts of men are not the same, and the results of their labor cannot be the same. Communistic theories, whether they be the result of ungodly hate directed against those who are more gifted, or of mistaken love directed towards those who are less gifted, are but so many vain schemes to subvert God's ordinance and thus—sometimes maliciously, sometimes ignorantly—to introduce the miseries of anarchy. Christians recognize the divine plan of service in love, and are therefore not only content that this plan should prevail, but advise the wisdom and love of God as displayed in His beneficent design, and cheerfully conform to the divine order, and assiduously urge it upon their fellow-men as the way of social peace and prosperity. But they recognize the law and power of love as an essential element in that plan. Love puts the gifts of each into the service of all. He who has great talents or large possessions is the Lord's steward to whom much has

been entrusted; he who has small gifts or little earthly goods is the Lord's steward to whom little has been committed through the same infinite love: both are to administer their trust in the Lord's name, and to hold themselves in readiness at any moment to give an account of their stewardship. Each finds enough to do in utilizing the talent which he possesses for the accomplishment of his Lord's purpose; neither has cause to envy the other, for it is love directed by infinite wisdom that has made the apportionment, and this not only with a view to the work to be done, but also to the account to be rendered. The Lord doeth all things well, and the Christian knows it. If I have one talent and my neighbor has ten, if I am poor and my neighbor is rich, it is well thus; for thus my dear Lord, who knows best how "to divide to every man severally as He will" and thus best to accomplish the purpose of His love, has ordered it for my good as well as for the good of my fellow-men. And no one is at a disadvantage by the apportionment, because every gift is bestowed for the benefit of all. Every Christian is a servant of the Lord to dispense bounty, according as the Lord has prospered him, to the necessity of others. Love is the power which equalizes all. What one lacks, others are able to supply; and the love which is wrought in the hearts of believers prompts them to supply it. There is thus a Christian socialism of love, such as we see manifested in the account of the early Christians who provided for the poor at Jerusalem—a socialism of which modern projects which equally ignore the rights of property and the duties of love, are miserable travesties. Love is the true equalizer, for it lays everything that a Christian has at the feet of the Lord, who has given all, to be used in His service according to His will.

But it is a total failure to comprehend the divine plan when it is inferred, that every Christian must surrender all his property for the common good and devote all the proceeds of his labor, except so much as may be absolutely needed to sustain his own life and that of the persons whom Providence has made dependent upon him, to the work of the church and the needs of his neighbor. There is no divine command of such an import. The Scriptures recognize the right of the individual to use for his own benefit as well as

for the benefit of others the gifts entrusted to him. He should love his neighbor as himself. He cannot bestow on his neighbor what he cannot allow to himself. He has no right to beg, when he is too lazy to work and eat his own bread. In such a case his duty is to arouse himself from his lethargy and, as against his neighbor, according to the ordinance of God requiring him to labor and forbidding idleness, earn his own livelihood. And what is his duty is also the duty of his neighbor. "When we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat." 2 Thess. 3, 10. A Christian is aware that according to the law of love he cannot claim his neighbor's bread when he is able to labor and make his own living; but the same rule he must apply to his neighbor who appeals to him for the necessaries of life. What love will not grant to ourselves it will not grant to others. "For we hear that there are some among you which walk disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work and eat their own bread." 2 Thess. 3, 11-12. Love must determine when we must help our neighbors, and how much his necessities require of us. If there is a case of emergency in which the absence, or the lovelessness, of others who could help throws the burden of assistance upon me, the love which the grace of God has wrought in my soul must surely prompt me to save his life, even if this should require the sacrifice of my wages for a day or two, or render it necessary to do without butter or sugar, tea or coffee, cake or pie, cigars or wine, or anything else that can be dispensed with for the time. There can be no law laid down in such matters, because God has given us no law but that of love. So in regard to giving to the church. There may be times of distress when the individual in his love will regard it as necessary to deprive himself of every luxury in order that his gifts may help to bridge over the trouble. But there is no law that specifically requires this, as there is no law that he shall eat no cakes and drink no tea, because the cost of these luxuries would have supplied some unquestionable wants in others.

It is the peculiarity of love that it can brook no dictation.

The duty of giving for the support of the church is unquestionable. It is so plainly taught in the Scriptures that those who refuse to contribute towards carrying on its work are committing a sin which, if they will not repent and bring forth fruits meet for repentance, must eventually subject them to discipline and perhaps to death. Those who will do nothing and give nothing to accomplish the Lord's will as expressed in the commission which He has given to the Church, and will, after patient teaching and pleading, that they may see and perform their duty, persist in doing nothing and giving nothing, are not in harmony with the Lord and the Lord's people, and have no claim to membership in the Lord's body.

But this does not imply that the congregation may make laws directing to what special plans for executing the general commission which Christ has given to his church the members must contribute, how much each must give towards the work, and when these imposed dues must be punctually paid, and that if these laws are not strictly obeyed the offenders must be brought to justice and, in case of failure to satisfy the law's demands, be expelled from the communion of God's people. Christians have no right to bind upon the free people of the Lord laws and ordinances which Christ has not made and has not bound upon them. They recognize the duty of doing good and communicating, and know that with such sacrifices God is well pleased. But they do not recognize the duty of doing what human ordinances require of them, and have no reason to imagine that such subjection to the will of men is a sacrifice that is pleasing to God. They know the contrary, since the Lord has told them. "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," and has warned them, "Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the servants of men." 1 Cor. 7, 23. Therefore the more intelligently and devoutly Christians read their Bibles and the more wisely and conscientiously they strive to conform their lives to the Lord's commandments, the less are they inclined to submit to any human ordinances which are pretendedly put forth by divine authority. Tell them that they are stewards of the Lord's and that every dollar in their possession must daily be placed at the Lord's disposal, and they assent most cheer-

fully, for they know from the Scriptures that they and all that they have is the Lord's; and as His people they have no will and no purpose but that the Lord's will should be done. But tell them that they are subjects of a pope or a priest, a president or a pastor, and that these have decreed that each one must this day pay a dollar or a cent towards carrying on some project, disobedience to which decree would subject them to eternal torment, and they will give no heed to the unauthorized demand and the impotent threat. Even when a believer approves the object for which his money is asked, he will shun any appearance of evil by giving it on the grounds of a legal demand that is made on him by a pastor or a congregation. These can make no laws in the kingdom of God that would be laid as duties upon the conscience, or be enforced by spiritual pains and penalties; and the freemen of the Lord are not at all inclined to accept the imposition, and thus recognize the usurpation of powers which belong only to the Lord. The cause of the church is often sadly damaged by ignorant or tyrannical pressing of claims founded on human arrogance, with denunciations of death and damnation to delinquents, while the members cannot recognize the validity of the legal claim and merely smile at the ignorant arrogance which helplessly seeks to wield the thunderbolts of heaven. Many who have plenty to give and would cheerfully give it, if appeals were made to their love, will not part with a cent to further a scheme of extorting money from them by coercive legal measures which have no divine approval, and the prevalence of which would strip the kingdom of God of its evangelical principle and power. There is enough of this human arrogance and legalistic despotism in the world in the abominations of that anti-Christian institution which is called popery; we will have none of it.

The individual is responsible for the use of his gifts, and he must decide all questions pertaining to their employment. Another cannot decide for him and must not presume to decide for him. Therefore no congregation can impose a tax on its members and make its payment a duty. The members can agree to pay each a certain proportion of expenses seen to be necessary to carry on its work, and each is bound by the obligation which he has voluntarily assumed;

but one cannot dictate how much the love of another must pay to any given object. Any constraints or coercive measures are inconsistent with the nature of love. This always works freely as a power of the individual. Just so much charity as there is in the individuals constituting the church, so much charity will there be in the actions of the church. There is no common charity that will sanctify the uncharitableness of individuals in the community concerned. We may fairly argue that the church which teaches truth and righteousness is not responsible for the sins of individual members whose faith or conduct is not consistent with this teaching, but we can never, with any show of reason or right, argue that the right principles of an association and the right conduct of the majority of its members can render right the errors and delinquencies of individuals belonging to the association. Faith and love are personal concerns of each individual; joining an association that has right doctrine and inculcates right life does not make one's faith pure, or work pure love in the soul. There may in the best church be members who have neither true faith nor true love, and who, if they are not because of this expelled from the church militant, will certainly be excluded from the church triumphant. The grace of God deals with individuals and deals with each soul individually. Therefore so little as the faith and love of one individual can avail before God for another, so little can the faith and love of one individual be the rule for another's action. Even where there is unity in the faith, and that faith in accordance with its nature works by love, there will not, under the influence of that love, be the same judgment in regard to the importance of this work or that, or in regard to the amount of time or money to be appropriated to this work or that. As there are diversities of gifts so there will of necessity be diversities of operation. That which one in love decides to be the best in view of his powers and his circumstances may not, even if the decision should bear all scrutiny, be the best for others, who have different powers and are affected by other circumstances. Hence the attempt to make the judgment of one the rule for others is as unjust as it is unauthorized. There is only one regulative power in all the work of the church, which is the power of faith that worketh by love, and that

is an individual matter. That depends on the grace of God, and no human laws can control it. Any attempts which ignorant or arrogant men may make to control it, otherwise than by teaching the will of God, which, when it is known, love always approves and recognizes as its only guide, is a usurpation which Christians must resist as ultimately perilous to all church work.

The Christian's relation to the state is often falsely regarded as a guide in forming a right conception of his relation to the church. The rights and powers of the one are transferred to the other. If the state has the power to impose taxes for its support, may not the church, which has higher interests to subserve and which, needing money as well as the state, has higher claims upon our contributions, with equal authority make assessments upon its members and enforce the collection of the amounts assessed? It would seem so. The work of the church is infinitely more important than that of the state. The latter looks only to man's temporal welfare, the former is concerned about his welfare in all eternity. But the very fact which is urged to prove the superior importance of the one over the other, should direct thinking minds to see the fallacy of assuming that the church must have equal power with the state in imposing laws and enforcing obedience. The state has to deal with man so far as his life and conduct in this world are concerned, and its whole purpose places it under the category of law and legal compulsion and obligation. It is a divine institution as well as the church, but it has no power to save from the wrath to come, and no calling to meddle with God's arrangements for the execution of His plan of salvation. It is secular. It refers to our earthly life. It accomplishes its end when it secures external peace and prosperity in the community, and guards each one in the possession and exercise on such of the rights which God has given him in his earthly sojourn and pilgrimage. Men must respect each other's rights and in no manner interfere with their exercise. If there are some who refuse to do this, the government "beareth not the sword in vain." "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth

the ordinance of God." Rom. 13, 1-2. The civil government bears the sword to compel obedience, not the gospel to persuade and to secure, or endeavor to secure obedience by moral suasion. According to the Lord's ordinance the citizen must obey the laws of the land. If he does so willingly and cheerfully, it is well; but if he does not do it willingly and cheerfully, he must do it anyhow, or suffer the consequences of his disobedience. Appeals to alleged rights of private judgment and individual conscience against existing laws are useless. The law must be enforced, and neither the police nor the courts have anything to do with quibbles or scruples about the righteousness of the law which they are called to enforce. If a man is not satisfied with the laws of the land in which he lives, he may use all legitimate means to effect a change for the better, or, failing in this, he may go to a country which in his estimation has better laws; but if he remains, he must obey. The government could not maintain itself if it did not use its power to enforce obedience.

But the church has no such power. It stands under the dispensation of the gospel, not of law. It is a kingdom which is not of this world. Its object is the salvation and sanctification of the soul by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, not the external welfare of men independently of this. It therefore has no king but Christ and can recognize no law but His Word. Hence it can lay no obligation on us but that which the Lord has imposed, and must always allow and respect the appeal to His Word as given us in the Scriptures when anything is presented as obligatory. It must not presume that the congregation or synod can make a law which settles the question of duty. Enlightened Christians will not submit to any such arrogance. They will not recognize such power even when it is used to enforce God's Word, much less will they recognize it when it is used to enforce human ordinances against God's Word.

The State, having no other purpose than that of outward order and peace, can allow of no appeal to the judgment of the individual as against the judgment of the properly constituted authorities. If a man insists on personal independence and the consequent right to judge for himself and to do as he pleases, he should not be

surprised to find himself clubbed by the police or lodged in the penitentiary for violation of the laws which are designed for protecting the rights of others as well as his own, and which are promulgated by the proper authorities, to which he as well as all other citizens owe obedience, and against which he has no rights. But if the church, forgetful of its very right to exist only as a brotherhood of faith under the Lord Jesus, who alone is King and whose will alone has authority, should make laws other than the King has declared in His Word, any individual may, and every Christian should protest against the usurpation, and appeal to the liberty which the King has given all believers from every yoke of human bondage. The law of love is recognized by every Christian, because that is the Lord's will and is the fulfilling of the divine purpose expressed in all divine obligations; but human dictations as to how that love shall act in every individual and under all circumstances, and therefore how much of his earthly goods shall be devoted to one purpose and how much to another, thus denying to that love the right of unconstrained and untrammeled action, must be steadfastly resisted, as all interferences with Christian liberty must be strenuously opposed.

In the old dispensation contributions were regulated by law, and that has led not a few to the opinion that the most effective way to secure the money necessary for church work would be the introduction of the Jewish system of tithes. Much could be said in its favor as a suggestion for the guidance of Christian love in its offerings to the church. It certainly was a wise arrangement in the times and under the circumstances of the people of God under the Old Testament. But it must not be overlooked that it belonged to a pedagogical system that is not in force now. The substance has come in Christ and the shadows have done their work and passed away. The scaffolding is removed when the building is finished. The temporary law of tithes must not be bound upon the Christian people, who are not under the law, but under grace. Not even as a regulation of expediency could it now, when there are so many who are very rich and so many who are very poor, be universally recommended as equitable and practicable. It is true that in this way a larger income could be secured

for the church, assuming that the plan would not diminish the number of its members; for the rich only exceptionally contribute in that proportion. If they agreed to pay one-tenth of their income into its treasury, its work would be greatly strengthened and extended. But those who have not the love that prompts to liberal things would hardly agree to pay such large amounts as would fall to their share, and any attempt to enforce the plan would be a sin against the principles of Christ's kingdom, and would prove a failure besides, because many, probably most of the rich, would refuse to join or remain in a congregation that attempted such coercive measures. Nor would it under the law of love be a fair and satisfactory solution of the problem that confronts us. For people of moderate incomes it might be a good guide for the distribution of their gifts. But one-tenth of a poor man's earnings of $300 a year is not at all, in the view of charity, the same proportion as one-tenth of a rich man's income of $50,000 a year. Five thousand dollars contributed annually by the latter would seem princely, compared with which the annual contribution of thirty dollars by the former appears petty. But when a poor man has a family to support on three hundred a year, even an ardent love for the church and a constant practice of self-denial might find it impossible to contribute one-tenth of it without entailing suffering upon his family; and when a rich man has fifty thousand to dispose of, and devotes only five thousand of it to church work, he certainly does not need to practice self-denial and make sacrifices in order to do it. He could give forty thousand a year and still live in luxury. Of course in these days of manufacture and commerce the demands of business and the opportunities of large service by devoting income to the increase of business, must not be overlooked. We do not overlook it. But it only serves to show the correctness of our contention that the tithe system, in our day, is not an equitable and practicable plan, even if it were introduced as a measure of expediency adopted in the exercise of liberty. It would be a good rule for some, not for others.

Our conclusion is that there is no effectual way to secure funds for Christian work but that of making Christians, whose faith works by love, and of rooting and ground-

ing them in the faith, that they may abound more and more. The trouble in our age is not merely the mammon worship that prevails, but that the church, instead of opposing it by setting forth the only way of peace and prosperity in time and of blessedness in eternity, and of exposing and denouncing the sin of setting mammon against God as an object of worship, panders to the abomination of selfishness and thus helps to overthrow the law of love as a power of faith within the Christian soul. The various schemes which have been concocted and which are in vogue in so many churches, by which the love of pleasure has been utilized to draw crowds and raise money, and which selfish church members have advocated, not only because they too want their amusement and their fun, and do not see why the church should not furnish it and make money by it, but because it furnishes their avarice an excuse for not giving are an evil and a menace to the life of the church. If we want to have congregations that are active and liberal, abounding in good works, we must "preach the Word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine," (2 Tim. 4, 2) not trust in human expedients that appeal to the natural man and that undermine the love which alone makes cheerful givers. Giving is a grace; let us recognize that, and act accordingly. Let the grace of God declared and communicated in the gospel have opportunity to do its work. Congregations are inexcusable when they lay human plans and resort to carnal motives for extorting money from the people, instead of plying the Word that will make Christians of them, whose faith will work by love. This will need nothing but guidance by the Word of the Lord to secure the necessary contributions for the church. "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. 2, 10. Congregations are equally inexcusable when they use no means and make no efforts to keep the people properly informed as to the work which the church has to do and where the contributions are needed, and when they do nothing effectual to gather in the gifts which the love of the members may prompt them cheerfully to contribute. Let the church not fail to give the necessary instruction as to what the Lord's will is and how it is to be

executed, that those whom the Lord has made cheerful givers by making them true Christians may have the needful light for the guidance of love in its free exercise. But let it never be overlooked that giving is a grace, and that the Lord's will is not done when the selfish propensities of men are called into action as inducements to contribute and when the mere purpose of getting money is secured. The church must ever keep its high calling of bringing salvation to lost souls in view, and it is never faithful to its Lord when it substitutes the means for the end, or in any way makes or encourages the impression that He needs or desires any contributions other than those which His grace induces people to make out of love for Him and His cause. Giving is a grace, and only cheerful givers please God and have the promise that their work will be prospered.

THE PAROCHIAL SCHOOL PROBLEM.

BY REV. PROF. THEO. MEES, WOODVILLE, O.

II.

In a former article I discussed at some length several features of our parochial schools which, in my estimation, are responsible for unsatisfactory results, as we are wont to regard them.

I was about to say "parochial school *system*," when the fact, that we have no such system, stayed my pen. It is true, all parish schools have in common instruction, more or less systematic, in religious matter, such as Bible Histories, Church Hymns and Catechism. Many do not essay to accomplish much more than preparatory work for confirmation, with a little casual work in German reading and writing, and perhaps some "figuring." Others claim pretensions to a more elaborate curriculum, but with no definite ideas of accomplishing a stated amount of work and reaching a fixed goal. A few are organized according to a strictly scientific system and employ advanced methods

to meet the requirements of our environments and demands of life.

To speak of such multiform organizations as a school system, notwithstanding some general common characteristics, would be presumptuous. And this very condition has helped to bring unsavory criticism upon our whole school work by such not favorably disposed to it, and at the same time has made it difficult for conscientious patrons successfully to refute strictures.

It would therefore seem justifiable to inquire, whether this difficulty could not, at least in a measure, be removed, and a certain degree of homogeneity be established in all such schools, over which trained teachers preside. An affirmative answer is at once met by "ifs and ands." Let us examine some of the more plausible.

The school belongs to the congregation, which has the right and the power to define its character and to outline its work. If now a congregation is satisfied with the work done, no matter how slipshod or superficial, who has the right to interfere? The same argument would apply to other congregational matters and abuses. Have we no remedy for this? If synodical jurisdiction means anything, it must mean, that through the proper means, exhortation and instruction, visitation and correction, abuses must be removed and uniformity in doctrine and *practice* attained. This to a degree is accomplished in the congregation, although here, too, much remains to be done, *e. g.* the endless variety of liturgical forms. Why is the school exempt from this fostering care?

My experience has taught me, that where the subject is approached in the right way, not merely in "glittering generalities," or stereotyped phrases, but by clearly stated facts and pedagogical arguments, with the pastor and teacher alive to take the initiative, even old-rooted bias and long-cultivated absurdities are amenable to such efforts, and from sickly counterfeits excellent schools have been developed.

In order to bring system out of chaos, *systematic supervision* is required. Nor will interest and inquiry suffice; but as methodical teaching is a *science* at once, and an *art*, such supervision must be *technical* in its character, *i. e.* it

must be conducted by a trained teacher. Only one, who at a glance can recognize the deficiencies of the work in a school; who is not imposed upon by the brilliant exhibits of the annual examination, but can point out the defects and suggest the remedy; one who can enforce his theory by taking the class in hand and obtain results; one who can command the respect of the teacher and the pupils by his evident grasp and command of the work: such an one only can successfully hope to systematize our schoolwork.

The point made, that this can be accomplished by annual teachers' conventions, is but partly conclusive. Theory may be successfully elaborated in such meetings, but the practical application belongs to the schoolroom and class. One need but observe the unsatisfactory results of training pupils fresh from the instructor's hands, in actual classwork, to recognize the truth of the statement; patient and persevering labor alone remedies the defects.

In addition, a comparative *uniformity of methods* and *grade of proficiency* is required. The former will result from a long-continued and carefully adjusted course of training in the seminary. I do not claim, that in the light of experience and well directed private study, a teacher should in no wise depart from the methods pursued in the seminary at the time of his training; but I do mean, that one should show conclusive reasons for adopting methods, which perchance in the hand of some adept have wrought excellent results, yet are at variance fundamentally with approved scientific laws. Here again the value of intelligent supervision is apparent, both for the great body of schools and for the seminary—the benefits will be mutual.

Greater difficulty may be experienced to meet the second requirement—an approximate uniformity of proficiency in corresponding grades. I am well aware of the fact, that very few schools in our synodical body are strictly graded schools, even where two or more teachers are employed, simply because no normal classification is recognized. In schools with one teacher no attempt even is made beyond the accidental graduation of individuals. Now my conviction is, that the trouble lies primarily in the endeavor to accomplish *too much* in the one case, and the sentiment to be satisfied with *too little* in the other. Both extremes need

a regulation according to some mean, which has been tested, and which is elastic enough to conform to varying conditions and circumstances.

Too much is attempted, when, with our facilities and time allotment, we aspire to a rivalry with the public schools of equal grade in all the furbelows of "modern" educational notions. It is a grievous error of that system to foist upon primary education much of that which belongs to a higher grade, not so much, perhaps, in the *matter* taught as in the manner and degree. The child-mind has a fixed limit of power of assimilation. Whatever transcends that power, in matter or form, is waste of time and positively hurtful to the normal development of all *mental* faculties and, what is worse, of evil effects morally,—a forced growth.

Too little is the other extreme, which would limit school work to mere instruction in religious matter, with a little of "odds and ends" to fill out time, trusting to the public school at some later day to supply deficiencies. This is robbing the child of glorious opportunities and dwarfing its mind to the semblance of a sickly cellar-growth.

The "happy medium," which alone can accomplish the greatest good and achieve the most salutary results for our children must be the resultant of three factors: *a*) the *natural aptitude and mental capacity of the child,* represented by its normal development in years and the influences of its environments; *b*) *the facilities of instruction,* represented by the organization of the school and the possible number of school-days and years; and *c*) *the practical object and aim,* conditioned by the general social position and future probable occupation of the pupil after leaving school.

It is a serious fallacy, which in the past two decades has shaped the course of the public school, to develop the mental powers by so-called "natural methods," while losing sight of the important fact, that as little as the natural muscles of a child can be developed beyond a fixed limit dictated by physical laws, so little can the child-mind be made to outgrow its physical limitations; and ignoring the almost axiomatic fact, that a certain amount of *positive matter* must be stored up in the brain, which will furnish constant food for the expanding intellect, and on the principle of the association of ideas, multiply itself from itself.

Our aim is to avoid this pedagogical error and, without creating machines, provide all mechanical parts together with the fuel for developing the motive power. The *method* cannot be elaborated in this place, it belongs to the technique of the profession and has been set forth in a small volume for teachers. And here I claim for our schools, in theory at least, a decided advantage over the public school as constituted at present. It is not a question of competition, therefore, and should not be viewed as such, but a plain, common sense utilitarian question, which may not appeal so powerfully at once to the rather sentimental spirit of the day, but nevertheless can well afford the scrutiny of sound judgment.

In order not to be misunderstood, however, I will say, that I do by no means eliminate instruction in such branches as drawing, music, the natural sciences, from our course; I rather assign to them an important part as intellectual and practical branches, practical to so great a degree, that without them a rational preparation of our children for their future usefulness in life becomes questionable. What a glorious world of beauty and usefulness would be cut out from the universe of our existence if we should learn to view God's magnificent creation merely as a commercial commodity and be blind to the overwhelming evidences of divine love and wisdom in the laws of nature and its profound mysteries. It would be criminal so to debase our natures, by limiting the esthetic inclination of the soul to the mere question of correct dress and proper harmony of colors in gowns, where the universe itself is a glorious symphony of beauty, from the humblest flower to the star-studded firmament. If, I take issue with the common school system in this matter, reference is had to the *method* in vogue, which is probably the result of a faulty conception of the purpose and end in view, and which merits the designation of "ornamentals."

Attention has been directed to the evil effects of isolation on the best efforts of a teacher. We are here confronted "by a condition," not a theory, and in casting about for a remedy I cannot hope to escape criticism, but the suggestions offered here may lead to a practical solution. I would earnestly pray pastors of congregations which employ

young teachers, to reduce their services in whatsoever capacity outside of their immediate schoolwork, to a minimum. After conscientious labor in the school-room of from five to six hours, the short time before nightfall is an absolute necessity for mental rest. The evening is none too short for a careful outlining and preparation of next day's work. Such "masters" whose wealth of knowledge is concealed in their sleeves that need but shaking, should be classed as museum freaks. Long experience may create a routine, but even it cannot compensate for study. Where several teachers are employed, daily communication and interchange of opinions become powerful factors in a teacher's professional life. A view expressed, a suggestion offered, an experience related may direct the trend of thought, open up new avenues for exploration, solve at once difficult problems. But where a teacher is thrown solely upon his own resources, I know of no better helps than professional books. The library of a teacher need not be extensive, but what it contains must be *mastered*, not in the sense, that its contents have been perused, and a few striking passages noted to be paraded in quotation. The experiences of others must be studied in the light of our own experience and tested; not experimentally, but along well defined pedagogical lines. Such work demands thorough assimilation of the matter and consequent adaptation to the individuality of the teacher and the requirements of his school. All this consumes time and presupposes a degree of mental elasticity. Let school-officials remember this.

Finally I would urge all our teachers to cultivate professional intercourse with accomplished teachers of the public schools. There is nothing to justify the sentiment that such schools are beneath our notice, nor can I see danger of unwholesome infection. There is much that is sound and practical in the public schools; eminent educators are laboring to advance them to a high degree of proficiency, and men of broad experience are found in the ranks of the teaching force: what good reason should cause us to stand aloof and forego the many advantages to be derived both for us professionally and for the general good of our scholars, who sooner or later, as a rule, enter these schools?

My observation through many years has borne out the theory, that mutual benefits result from a conservative professional contact with the public schools. On a line with this suggestion is the opportunity of garnering many a grain of practical school-knowledge by attending the so-called teachers' institutes, whenever practicable. It will be found upon trial, that teachers from our schools are heartily welcomed by the profession, and their views, if properly advanced, are given respectful hearing. I am not ashamed to acknowledge many a benefit from such gatherings during a period of twenty years.

That small salaries, which are the rule among us, must in a measure react discouragingly upon the ardor and efficiency of a teacher, goes without saying. What remedy can be applied in this case? In the majority of cases probably, under normal circumstances, the acknowledged ability and faithful work of a teacher will lead to improvement in time. Habits of economy and freedom from luxurious tastes and "fads" have a wonderful influence to double the purchasing power of a dollar. The only specific, however, suggested by my experience is the perfect knowledge of the importance of the calling and the unswerving sense of duty we owe to Him who has called us. To one who consecrates himself with all his powers and resources to the Divine Master; whose sole aspirations are, to be found worthy of such great trust; whose final object is humbly to *serve* in obedience to the planning and disposing, the directing and governing of God:—to such an one, what the world calls sacrifices, will be a free gift, and what would discourage the soul of others, will become a blessed hope and joyous faith.

THE LITURGY OF THE EUCHARIST.

BY REV. PROF. W. D. AHL, ST. PAUL, MINN.

To beautify the services of the Lord, to make them as attractive and edifying as possible has been the aim of the church of God from the very beginning. This desire has led to the introduction of art in every form into the church,

offering to God only the best that man can attain. Out of this longing also have sprung the different liturgical forms which we find connected with our services. These forms, then, cannot be dead forms only, devoid of any merit or practical use. They should and do help to beautify the services of the Lord. It is, therefore, somewhat hard to understand why so many Lutheran Christians do not care for a full liturgical service; in fact sometimes even reject it. This seems to be the case particularly with regard to the celebration of the Lord's Supper. How naked, how bare are these services in some congregations! The only reason imaginable for such a state is the want of a better understanding of the beauty and appropriateness of these forms.

Many seem to consider them as something Roman and therefore objectionable. This, however, is a false conception. As in everything else the Lutheran Church appears as the real and true Church of the Reformation, restoring whatever had been misused and corrupted to its original integrity and purity; so also in her liturgy. What has been brought down from our fathers from the apostolic times up to the middle ages, that is what she has taken and purified from all the trash of Roman superstition. The liturgy, therefore, is nothing specifically Roman, but rather of a catholic, an ecumenic character.

One more point should be mentioned before proceeding to the liturgy proper, as it might help to clear the way for a better understanding. In the early Christian church no service took place without the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which celebration was considered to be the climax of the Christian's worship, without which no service was thought complete. Only later on, when her members seemed to be less anxious of partaking of this holy supper we find services without it. When we, therefore, now consider the liturgy of the Eucharist separately, we should not forget that such celebration is only a part, and that the highest part of the Christian service.

As stated just now the celebration of the Lord's Supper is the climax of the entire service. The worshiping congregation has been ascending higher and higher, till she has reached the heights of Tabor and is now about to enter into

a most blessed and intimate union with her Lord. She stands at the threshold of the Holy of holies, hearing from within the warning voice of God, "Take off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." Mindful of this the congregation draws nigh with the penitent prayer,* "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me; cast me not away from Thy presence and take not Thy Holy Spirit from me. Restore unto me the joy of Thy salvation and uphold me with Thy free Spirit." Ps. 51, 10-12. "Wash we thoroughly from mine iniquities and cleanse me from my sin." V. 2.

Humbly, with a cleansed heart she has drawn nigh, she has offered herself to her God. And He hears and accepts her prayer and her offering. Through His minister He sends her His salutation. This the congregation receives as a promise that God will be gracious unto her and give her His sacrament. And she returns His salutation to the officiating minister, thereby wishing him the blessing of God for a proper performance of his sacred duty. This he begins by fully comforting the depressed hearts by directing their thoughts up to the Lord, from whom alone cometh all comfort. "Lift up your hearts," he calls unto them, *i. e.*, Be no longer cast down, look up and rejoice, for the Lord is nigh. And the congregation is but too willing, too glad to do so. From experience she knows what a gracious Lord she has. Therefore she responds, "We lift them up unto the Lord." Having thus gained assurance of her Lord's grace and mercy, what else can she do but sing songs of praise and thanks unto Him who so kindly visits His people. And this the congregation does in words and songs as if she were already celebrating with the heavenly hosts above, with angels and archangels around her. Forgetting awhile their earthly cares and sorrows the people of God on earth feel themselves one with the blessed of God above. With the song of the seraphims in heaven (Isaiah 6, 3) they gather around their

---

*Cfr. German Hymnal No. 295, with the singing of which this part of the service usually was opened and during which the congregation of old brought her offering, thereby expressing that she offers herself wholly to the Lord her God. In our English Hymnal I miss this song.

Lord and worship Him as the Holy One of God who is now again drawing nigh unto them. And gladly they receive Him, singing the old song of welcome as once did the people of Jerusalem at His first advent, "Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest." Here ends the first part of the *communio*, and now we come to the very height of celebration, the consecration, together with the distribution.*

According to our liturgy this part is opened with the Lord's Prayer, which in this place is to be considered as a prayer of consecration, (cfr. Magazine of 1893, No. 4, p. 205 and 206) whereby according to our old dogmaticians, *symbola ad sacrum usum destinantur*. Bread and wine shall now be separated from a common and ordinary use and be set apart for a sacred use, or in other words they shall be sanctified. Now according to 1 Tim. 4, 5 everything is sanctified by the Word of God and prayer. And what prayer could be more appropriate than the one which our Savior himself has taught us. So the church uses this prayer, because here, in this holy act, she wants to have the very words of the Lord himself. Having thus blessed the external symbols the minister by reciting the words of the institution reminds the Lord of His gracious promise regarding this sacrament, and holding out to Him His own word and command asks Him to do now as He has promised. And the people of God fully trusting that He will do so, salute Him as already present. Both exalted and filled with awe at the presence of Him, who is now again giving himself for them, they fall down upon their knees and worship the Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world.

But, as always when sinful man comes in contact with the holy, so now too the consciousness of their manifold

*Between these two parts, however, we find the exhortation. The exhortation is specifically Lutheran as it was introduced by Luther. It is sometimes a paraphrase of the Lord's prayer, (which was then dropped in the act of consecration) sometimes a distinct formula of itself, and then again it consists of both together. It does not seem to fit very well into the order of the liturgy, but is yet of great practical use and therefore taken up into most Lutheran liturgies. As its name implies it purposes to exhort the communicant to worthily receive the Lord's sacrament and serves, therefore, the same end as did the call "Sancta sanctis" in the old church.

sins seizes upon their souls. How can they stand before the Holy One? The higher they ascend, the deeper they bend their knees. Therefore their earnest supplication, Have mercy upon us, and again and more fervently they cry, Have mercy upon us, till finally this cry for mercy sounds out in an urgent prayer for peace, "Grant us Thy peace."

And the Lord cannot but answer such earnest appeal. Has He not come to bring peace to mankind? Was that not the fruit of His suffering and death? Therefore, as He once came to His disciples on that memorable Easter-day bringing them His peace, so He now comes to the worshiping congregation and bestows upon her His peace. "The peace of the Lord be with you all." Thus having found favor with her Lord, she proceeds to the altar and there partakes of His body and His blood, given and shed for her. What more can she ask? She has ascended as high as is possible for her during her pilgrimage upon earth. The longing of her heart has been fulfilled; with joyful heart she now can hasten home, for she has seen the Lord of glory. The words of Simeon are now her own, "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation, which Thou hast prepared before the face of all people." O what joy and happiness is hers! How could she sufficiently praise and glorify her gracious Lord! All her glorias and songs of praise are but a feeble attempt to express what she really feels. Forever she would like to dwell in the house of the Lord. But as long as she yet belongs to the church militant, she must return to the battlefield; but, dismissed with the benediction of the Lord, she enjoys the blessedness of heaven already here upon earth, even in the midst of the toil and weariness of the week. Therefore she longs for each single Sunday; therefore she sighs and sings with the psalmists:

How amiable are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts! My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord. For a day in Thy courts is better than a thousand. One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in His temple.

A PLEA FOR A MORE EXTENDED USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY REV. J. SHEATSLEY, DELAWARE, O.

That the New Testament is used far more freely both in private devotion and in the public services of the congregation than the Old Testament is a well known fact. That it should be so everyone will furthermore at once concede. The way of life is so much more fully and plainly revealed in the New Testament than in the Old that it would be the greatest folly, if the church should reverse the above order. Yet, the question has been asked before and, in the writer's estimation, it is well to ask it again and indeed to ask it frequently, whether the disproportion, as it exists at present in our churches, is not too great. In the system of pericopes commonly used in the Lutheran church in this country, there are only some five lessons taken from the Old Testament and all of these except the one for Epiphany Sunday, fall upon festivals that have been perhaps entirely discarded. It follows, where pastors use this system year after year both for lectionaries and for the texts of their sermons and where congregations have but one service in the week, that the people practically do not hear a word from the Old Testament in the entire year. The pastor may make a free use of the Old Testament in the development of his New Testament texts and he may also occasionally use the former in special services or upon funeral occasions, but in both these cases the use of the Old Testament will be very limited. Is not the above state of affairs abnormal? There seems to be a feeling of this kind both in the mother country and in our own, at least in the Joint Synod. In Germany a number of new systems have been framed, some of them being taken entirely from the Old Testament as that of Nitzsch, now appearing in the *Zeitblaetter*. In our own synod the fact that such a system is being published in one of our magazines and that it seems to be widely used by the pastors, indicates a desire to utilize more freely the wealth of the Old Testament Scriptures.

It is of course urged that in congregations where more

than one service in the week is held, the New Testament should be used in the chief service, while the Old may be used in the secondary, and that thus the New Testament retains the chief position in the service of the church as it should, and the Old at the same time receives due consideration. But even in regard to such congregations it should be noted that many members attend but the chief service of the week and consequently hear little or nothing of the Old Testament throughout the entire year. And it is urged also that in congregations where there is but one service in the week or but one in two or three weeks as is the case in many charges, it becomes especially necessary to use the New Testament in preference to the Old, in order that the people may get the very best. But here also it may be questioned whether it is the proper thing to do to set the Old Testament aside so entirely. A plea is therefore made for a more extended use of the Old Testament in the chief service of the church, so that the entire congregation may hear how the Lord dealt with His people of old. If it should be said that the people may make a diligent use of their Bibles at home, both of the Old and the New Testament, it may be replied that they may and should indeed do this, but it is to be feared that in the case of many all the Scripture they hear through the entire week is what they hear on Sunday in God's house.

However, so far only bare statements have been made. What ground is there for discarding in a measure the use of the New Testament in the service of the church for the sake of a more extended use of the Old Testament? In general for the purpose of Christian edification the New Testament is far superior to the Old. Shall we discard the superior for that which is inferior? This form of argument with respect to the subject in hand is, however, hardly fair. If it were simply a matter of choice between one and the other, the decision could of course be easily given. But such is not the case, since we have the privilege and the opportunity to use both. Or if it were simply a question as to the benefits in general to be derived from the two, the answer could be easily given. On the other hand, the reasoning must proceed in accordance with the fact that both the Old Testament and the New were given for specific

purposes and that it can therefore not be the question of the superiority of one book over the other, but rather that each book be used for the specific purpose for which it was divinely intended. Accordingly the assertion that the New Testament should be used almost exclusively in the church service seems to rest on the assumption that, to the church under the new dispensation, the Old Testament is of no use at all or, at least, of very little use which could not be served much better by the New. That such an assumption would be false needs not to be shown. But it would also be false reasoning, if it should be affirmed that the importance of the Old Testament rests simply on its relation to the New and that its writings therefore have no use except as they lead up to, interpret, or confirm the revelations of the New. The Old Testament is indeed the key to the New but the New is also the key to the Old. They are parts of one whole, of the full revelation, viz. of the will of God to sinful men, and they must therefore not be torn asunder. The Old Testament economy was propædeutic to the New, and the New is the fulness of the Old. So also the Old Testament Scriptures are propædeutic to the New, so that the latter cannot be fully mastered without a mastery of the former.

But it would be altogether wrong to affirm that this is the only purpose of the Old Testament. If it were, its use might be limited to the professor's chair and pastor's study, and be entirely discarded in the public services of the church. Nor is it correct to assume that the only other purpose of the Old Testament is to teach Christ directly. Without in the least intimating that Christ is not the center of the Old just as He is also of the New Testament, it needs to be emphasized that it is all wrong to think that in every section of the Old Testament we must find, if not a distinct, yet an indistinct, reference to Christ. In accordance with this supposed principle there have been already some strange exegetical freaks and miserable homiletical applications of Old Testament passages. It is good to preach Christ, and, indeed, the true evangelical preacher will preach nothing else but "Christ and Him crucified," but it is possible for one to take such a narrow view of this apostolic rule as in a great measure to fail in preaching Christ according to the

apostolic standard. To preach Christ and Him crucified means to declare "all the counsel of God," for Christ, being the center of both the Old and the New Testaments, is necessarily at the same time just as wide as these revelations. Yet this is not to be understood in such a way that we must painfully look for a reference to Christ in every passage or chapter of the Bible. But still this opinion seems in some way to prevail, or it at least seems to offer an explanation why the Old Testament is so little used: preachers want to preach Christ, and since the New Testament is so much fuller and plainer in its statements concerning Christ and His work, they choose their lessons and texts almost entirely from this and lay the Old Testament aside on the ground that it does not teach Christ plainly and has no other particular uses.

It is with respect to the last point above that the writer wishes to take exception especially. The Old Testament has other and important uses aside from teaching Christ directly or serving merely as a key to the interpretation of the New. The implication of the discussion so far is not a presumptive affirmation that no one recognizes any other uses of the Old Testament than the two mentioned above, nor that no one really uses it for any other purpose, but simply that it is not used so extensively for other purposes as it should be, and that in consequence our people are deprived of much valuable spiritual discipline.

What are some of those other uses to which the pastor and preacher can put the Old Testament? First and foremost among these is this that the Old Testament emphasizes the

INTIMATE RELATION BETWEEN GOD AND HIS CREATURES.

The affirmation that the Old Testament teaches the intimate relation between God and His creatures in a more emphatic manner than the New may at the first thought seem very strange, especially, since it is under the New Dispensation that God by becoming man has united himself with the creature in the closest manner possible. It should be said, first of all, in explanation of the statement that it is not meant of the spiritual union between God and the believer, but of God's dealing with man and with His

creatures generally in a providential way. Neither is it meant that the New Testament does really not teach the closeness of this relation so emphatically as the Old, but that it lies deeper and is therefore not so easily seen as in the Old. The reason for this is evident: the whole Old Testament economy is more external, because preparatory, while that of the New is spiritual and internal, and therefore God's dealing with His people in the Old Dispensation stands out in bolder outline than in the New. One cannot study the history of Israel from the call of Abraham to the close of the Old Testament canon, or, for that matter, any other portion of Old Testament history, without being strongly impressed with the direct and open relation into which God entered with man, especially, with His own people. With Abraham and Moses and others the Lord spoke as man with man, He led the people of Israel with pillars of fire and of cloud, He thundered to them from Mount Sinai, He divided the waters of the sea and the Jordan, He fed them with manna, threw down the walls of Jericho, drove the Canaanites out with hornets, gave Israel kings, destroyed dynasties, gave the people into the power of their enemies on account of their sins, and when they repented delivered them again, and all this was done in such a sensuous way, a way so apparent to the senses, that one is forced to the conclusion that these things were not the result of natural laws and forces, but of the direct ruling and intervention of God. It is true that miracles were also performed in the New Testament era, yet, in the writer's mind, there is a difference between the two classes of miracles. The miracles of the Old Testament belong rather to the realm of providence, while those of the New, although they had to do with earthly things, were done almost exclusively for the sake of the new revelation, so that their purpose was not so much to prove that God directly controls the affairs of men as that Jesus was sent of God and that His message was true. The New Testament miracles were calculated to inspire faith in Christ and His message of salvation, while those of the Old were calculated to inspire faith in God as the living God who really controls the affairs of men, in contrast to the dead idols, and as a God of love and mercy who will do good to those who fear and love Him and walk

in His ways. With the old Hebrew the problem seems to have been chiefly this, Do the idols of the Gentiles, or does the living God, rule in heaven and upon earth? And divine revelation had to be of such a character therefore as to prove in the most direct and palpable manner that the Lord is God and does rule and is to be feared and loved and obeyed of men. For the Israelite of the time of Christ the problem was not to prove that the Lord is God, that lesson he had learned, but rather, how this God saves from sin and death, viz. not by a system of external works, but by a new life in Christ; "Ye must be born again," said Jesus to Nicodemus. What the New Testament demands is more spiritual than the demands of the Old, but for that very reason more difficult also to grasp. Nicodemus could not at all understand the statements of Jesus about the new birth, and only the most spiritual among Old Testament saints, such as David, could definitely see the blessedness of the "man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity," and the need of a new heart and new life. The entire New Testament revelation rests on this more spiritual basis, while the Old moved rather in the sphere of providence, of forms and types, pointing to the ministration of the Spirit which excels in glory (2 Cor. 2, 6 ss.). But just because, furthermore, the New Testament is concerned more about the internal and the spiritual, the external and sensuous is greatly overshadowed. Let this however suffice to show what is meant when it is stated that the Old Testament teaches in a more palpable manner than the New the intimate relation which God sustains to His creatures.

The question now is, why emphasize this matter so much? Is there any ground for affirming that teaching of the kind intimated above is especially necessary? Would it not on the contrary be a step backward to leave, even in a measure only, the more spiritual realm of the New Testament for the more sensuous of the Old? Does not the very fact that God has given us the more spiritual last show that He wants us to leave the old and take the new which is better? These are all questions which one has a perfect right to ask and they need to be answered. It may be replied, in the first place, that one will hardly dare to affirm that the human race has kept pace with this progressive

revelation, so that it has become spiritual in the same degree as the revelation itself has become spiritual. In the second place, not the same generation is living now that lived in the time of Moses; new generations are continually springing up who in a great measure have to pass through the same stages of experience as the human race has passed through. In the third place, nations and individuals are subject to variations in things spiritual; at times we need to preach the gospel in a special manner, at other times the law needs to be emphasized, and so also at times people need to be shown that God rules and not nature, and that He is intimately connected with the affairs of men. I believe that there is need for such preaching at the present time. Christians, without speaking at all of unbelievers, often seem to live as though God were millions of miles away, and not near to bless and to direct and to hear the prayers of His people. The Jew, it appears, doubted whether the Lord was a God "afar off" (Jer. 23, 23), to us the question rather seems to be, is He a God "near at hand?" This feature of the present state of Christians is, perhaps, at least in this country, observable in nothing so much as in the complete separation between the spiritual, or things pertaining to religion, and the natural. There seems to be a notion that we need to be religious only then when we are engaged in religious things, and it is overlooked that every thing needs to be religiously done and that the fear of God should be in our hearts as well upon the farm or in the shop as in the house of God. Religion for the Lord's day and for things religious, but for the rest of life mere morality will suffice. It is hard to detect the Christian, unless you happen to observe him while engaged in religious duties, or unless you directly ask him. This is evidently one chief reason why the world thinks that there is after all no real difference between the unbeliever and the Christian. You may go to a farmers' institute and hear the principles of farming discussed for a whole half day, and the probability is that you will not hear a word to intimate that the Lord has something to do with farming. The same is true of merchants or any other trade or profession. There is upon us now a presidential campaign, and there will be no end of argument and eloquence, but the probability is that not a word will be said to show that

God has something to do directly with the affairs of this government. It may be said that these divine factors are presupposed. It may be, but usually men are very careful to state just what is presupposed. It is all wrong and very bad. The above are but a few examples to show what is meant, and it is now contended that these facts need to be preached, and that Old Testament history is especially adapted to impress our people with the fact that the Lord rules in every domain and that His hand is present in all the affairs of men.

Furthermore, Old Testament history is calculated to impress us strongly with the

CLOSE CONNECTION BETWEEN SIN AND EVIL.

The word evil here is not meant to include sin itself which in one sense is the greatest evil, but such evils as war, famine, destructive storms, blights, and the like; not the evils that we do, but the evils we suffer. And the statement, furthermore, should not be pressed too far with respect to individual affliction, lest individual souls be unduly disturbed and burdened, but it is meant especially of evils of a more general and national character. There seems to be a feeling that evils of this character as droughts, floods, pests of insects come in some way by the course of nature, that God does not have anything to do with them directly, and especially that there is no real connection between them and sin, in short, that the causes of these evils are not moral, but physical, and that the remedy, therefore, is not to be sought in a moral reformation of the people, but in a better control of the physical laws and forces of nature. For example, much intellect and skill are employed to devise means for destroying the effects of insects upon fruit trees, but very little is said of the need of general repentance and of a fuller turning of the heart to the Lord. So also with respect to evils resulting from bad government: we are told that the remedy is to be sought in the ballot-box, in wiser laws and in better men at the head of the nation. There is certainly much truth in this, but the very fact already that the ballot-box continues to be abused and that, as it seems, we cannot get those wiser laws and better men, shows clearly enough that the real cause lies deeper. There is a strong tendency

to separate all along the line between the purely natural, economical, social, etc., on the one hand, and the moral on the other, as though the two realms had no connection with one another, whereas the real fact in the case is that the former are always largely conditioned by the moral status of the people. "Honor thy father and thy mother that it may *be well with thee*" is but one of the many divine utterances, proving the above proposition.

Now, it is affirmed here that the Old Testament is especially well adapted to impress men strongly with the close connection between the moral and the natural. This characteristic of the Old Testament is due to the fact that Old Testament history moved largely in the sphere of the providential, and God in His workings in providence never separates between the moral and the natural, but combines them most intimately, in order to show that "happy is that people, whose God is the Lord" (Ps. 144, 15). The experience of the people of Israel at such times when the Lord, on account of their sins, allowed them to be oppressed and spoiled by their enemies, but, upon humble repentance, again delivered and blessed them; special divine visitations concerning which the Lord revealed to them just why they were sent, as the three and a half years drought in the time of Elijah; the long list of blessings and curses as recorded in the 28th chap. of Deut.; prophetic utterances like these, "That which the palmerworm hath left hath the locust eaten; and that which the locust left hath the cankerworm eaten," etc. (Joel 1); "Ye have sown much, and bring in little; ye eat, but ye have not enough; ye drink, but ye are not filled with drink," etc. (Hag. 1, 6 ss.); "Prove Me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it," (Mal. 3, 10), and numerous other direct utterances and historical events are strikingly fitted to impress us with the fact that "righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people," (Prov. 14, 34) and that the righteous shall never beg bread (Ps. 37, 25). It is true that we have some cases of such direct divine intervention also in the New Testament as for example the death of Judas, of Ananias and Sapphira, of Herod Agrippa I, the destruction of

Jerusalem, and some others, yet they are mostly such as pertain only to individuals, except the last which, however, was the fulfillment of an Old Testament prediction and so really belongs to the Old Testament series; then also they are not so numerous, nor do they belong so fully in the sphere of providence.

Furthermore, the Old Testament is calculated to inspire us with a

MORE GENERAL FAITH IN GOD.

What is meant is this, that in the New Testament Christ stands out so prominently as the Savior from spiritual evils, or from sin, so much emphasis is laid upon faith in Him as the Savior from these evils, the eternal interests of the soul so overbalance all other considerations that there really sometimes seems to be danger of our getting in the way of thinking that God after all is not much concerned about our present temporal and bodily interests and that Jesus after all is our Savior only with respect to our spiritual and eternal interests. The question may at least be raised whether it is not possible to hold up Christ and Him crucified in such a manner that God appears to people only as the Savior from the eternal guilt of sin and therefore as the Savior only of eternal interests, but not as a God near at hand to help and to direct in the affairs of daily life. There are of course abundant utterances in the New Testament that should dispel any such delusion, but just because those other things are so very prominent these are partially and often altogether ignored. But in the Old Testament where revelation moved more in the realm of providence and because of its propædeutic character these inferior, if this term may be used, elements of our faith in God are made more prominent, and therefore, by using the two side by side in due proportion, both elements of the Christian faith, that which pertains to the spiritual and eternal and that which pertains to the bodily and temporal, will receive due consideration. That is what is meant by a more general faith in God. Something like this seems to be called for, in order to explain and remove the anomaly that so many professing Christians seem, on the one hand, willing to entrust Christ with the salvation of their souls, but

with respect to the body, on the other hand, seem not to feel safe until they have surrounded themselves with property, insurance, aid societies and the like. A diligent study of Old Testament history might help to dispel that delusion of the devil, and I believe also that God meant it to be used for that purpose.

The above are a few advantages which, it is here claimed, would accrue from a more extended use of the Old Testament. The arguments upon which the conclusions are based may not appear so patent to others as to the writer, but if this short discussion should have no other result than to lead some others to thinking about these things, it will not have been in vain. These matters, furthermore, may not appear so important to others as to him, but a little thought on the part of any one can hardly fail to convince him of the need of improvement in the things spoken of. The plan proposed here to remedy these evils may not be the best, but it will do good. The writer would add yet that in his own experience in preparing the Sunday school lessons taken from Old Testament history the points that were here spoken of and others were especially impressed upon his mind, and he came to the conclusion that a close and prayerful study of the Old Testament could not but be conducive in a very high degree to true godliness and happiness.

CHRIST'S RETURN TO JUDGMENT.

BY REV. L. M. HUNT, THORNVILLE, O.

God sent Jonah to preach repentance to Ninevah, and while the people hearkened the judgment was delayed. But when they turned again to their old sins and filled their cup of iniquity, God poured out His wrath upon them. Daniel stood before Babylon's haughty king, and spoke of the great God of heaven; but when the king turned a deaf ear to the admonitions, the hand wrote on the wall that he had been weighed in the balance and found wanting. Abraham besought the Lord, that if He should find ten right-

eous persons, He would spare Sodom and Gomorrah for their sakes. But when the rank smell and sorrowful wail of their sins brought God down to visit those cities, He found not the ten righteous persons there. So He overthrew those cities. The Son of man came to Jerusalem. He wept for her and would have gathered her children together as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings. But they refused to accept the Son and Heir when He came, and to be protected by His power. So their city and temple were laid level with the ground.

The Old Testament history, and the examples cited by Christ himself in the New Testament, show that cities and empires were destroyed because they had become so corrupt. And parallel with these, runs the account of the last days or of the judgment.

God was angry with the old world and destroyed it with the deluge, because men had become exceedingly corrupt. As the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. (See St. Matt. 24, 37-39). He shall scarcely find faith on the earth (St. Luke 18, 8). Men will be buying and selling, eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage. False prophets, evil doers, seducers, will arise and lead away many. The many were (since sin entered) on the broad road to destruction, while the narrow path of life has had a pilgrimage here and there. But the just inference is, that the number of the wicked will increase and the number of the faithful decrease, as the end draws nigh. Had there been ten righteous persons in Sodom and Gomorrah, they would have been spared. As long as the world contains a sufficient number of Christians, so long it will remain. True Christians are the salt of the earth. A great number of nominal Christians will count nothing against the day of wrath. They are the salt that has lost his savor. The Judge of all the earth will be righteous in His judgments, and will send His punishments upon the world, when it will no longer serve Him, but rebels against His word and power.

Christ will be the person of the Triune God to come to judgment. "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven." Acts 1, 11. "For the Father judg-

eth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." John 5, 22.

When Christ was born at Bethlehem, it was in a stable. Joseph and Mary were poor. Jesus was poor throughout His whole earthly life.

He had become poor for our sakes. The devils plotted for His destruction, and wicked men sneered at His apparent helplessness. He suffered untold agonies from His enemies. All the sufferings that hell could invent and all the reproaches that wicked men could devise, were heaped upon Him and He bore them without a murmur. He deeply humbled Himself to redeem man, and His Father exalted Him high above the heavens, being well pleased with His Son and His work.

Christ suffered all these things for our sakes, that He might be our Lord. As our Lord, He will come to separate us from this wicked world, from sin, death, and all powers of evil. The good and bad fish, the sheep and goats, the wheat and tares, shall then be separated for ever.

In accordance with this doctrine, we find the teachings of the church. "From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead."—Apostles' Creed. "And He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead."—Nicene Creed. "From whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead."—Creed of Athanasius. Our own Augsburg Confession says (Article XVII), "Also they teach that, in the consummation of the world, [at the last day] Christ shall appear to judge."

Poor helpless humanity is too proud and haughty to worship a Savior who died. Men are willing to honor an Almighty Creator, a Supreme Ruler, and an Allwise Being; but they have only contempt for a being who is born of a woman, suffers all indignities without resentment, and that, too, when He could have called legions of angels to His assistance. It is both right and reasonable that He who became man that He might call mankind His mother and His brethren and His sisters, should decide who is worthy of that name.

He who follows in faith and works in love for "The Poor Nazarene," is following and working for Him who

at the last day will judge him. He who reproaches Christ reproaches His own Judge; and he who despises the Judge, has only contempt for His judgment. Those who despise Christ, will be destroyed from the face of the Lord.

From this it can be easily seen that Christianity differs from all other religions. Men love to think and talk of a great broad-minded religion that covers the face of the earth. That all men have some sort of religion may be conceded, but that *any* religion is a power unto salvation is denied. When men speak of their broad religion that has branched out into sects: as Christianity, Judaism, Mohammedanism, Buddhism, etc., the true Christian is offended and refuses to allow Christ thus to be associated with men. All ways of entering into joy outside of Christ are false ways. Christ is the *only* true way; and all who expect to enjoy heaven, must pass under His judgment and meet His approval. Christianity is no sister-religion; it is *the* religion. All others are false; it alone is true.

As Christ is the Judge, only those who are pleasing to Him are saved. Those who die before that great day, will be raised again, and those who are living then shall be caught up to meet the Lord. None shall escape coming before the Judge. The living and the dead, the good and the bad, the believer and the infidel, must all appear before Him. All nations must stand before the Lord.

The Judge will then separate them into two classes. Those who have been wicked and perverse, who despised instruction and remained in ignorance of the plan of salvation, will be bound and cast into outer darkness. They will not be annihilated or cease to exist. Their punishment is the more terrible, because they cannot end their existence. The fires of hell are not intended to destroy man's being or power of feeling, but his happiness. The reprobate will continue after the judgment, but their very existence will be an aggravation to them. "Ungodly men and the devils shall He condemn unto endless torments." Aug. Con. XVII.

The rich man continued to be a man and to know and feel, for he understood he was in torments. The reprobate are separated from the true source of life, peace, joy, hap-

piness, glory and honor. They have just the opposite of the saved.

There will be another class of men before the Judge —those who have believed His Word, and have walked by the light of their faith. Man's eye may not have been able to see any marks set upon them. They may have been associated with the common herd of mankind; but the all-discerning eye of Christ will look not at appearances, but at the actual facts. According to man's faith it will be done unto him, and not according to what he may have done, or what the world may say about him. It is not a question of strong or weak faith. It is a question if a man's faith will bring him to Christ: if it will do that, it will bring him unto salvation.

Some will have died in the faith; others will be living in the faith but alike they will be saved. When the Judge descends from heaven, some will have lain in death a long time, others will have been in sickness, disease, sorrow, affliction, persecution, and tribulation. These things shall all end then; for the curse shall be taken off. He "shall give unto the godly and elect, eternal life and everlasting joys."

There shall be signs of the coming of the Son of man. These signs shall be in heaven and on earth. The sun, moon and stars shall show His coming. On the earth there shall be wars near by and rumors of wars afar off—a result of the growing wickedness of men. There will be earthquakes and roarings of the waves—great and wonderful disturbances by land and by water. There will be famines and pestilences. Men's hearts shall fail them, and many who were once believers, shall become cold and indifferent. The millennium will not come this side of the judgment. The world will become worse and worse, "as it was in the days of Noe," etc. The children of God will be at a discount as long as this old world stands. Their comfort and peace are not here, but in heaven.

The Judge will assign to each one his place. When the nations of the earth are called up before Him to be judged, He will not lose sight of the individual in that great mass of human beings. Each one will be noticed and each one will receive just judgment. The workers of iniquity

will be compelled to depart. Many may have done wonderful things, and, that too, in the name of Christ, but like the maid of Ephesus, who cried after Paul, they do these things to please men. The abode of these wicked ones is called Hades or Hell. Their master will be Satan; their companions fallen angels and lost men. This Hades or Hell is a prison in which the wicked will never cease to exist and from which they can never escape.

The saved are received into the everlasting habitations of peace and joy. Their abode is called Heaven, from which they will never be cast out.

The exact time of the coming of the Son of man, no one knows. But when all the prophecies and signs are fulfilled, we know the time is near. The careless and indifferent are likely to be caught unprepared, while those who "watch and pray" will be ready, having their lamps filled with oil when the Bridegroom cometh.

"He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus." Rev. 22, 20.

OUTLINES OF SERMONS ON FREE TEXTS.

BASED ON THE GERMAN OF J. HEINRICH SCHULTZE, BY PROF. A. PFLUEGER, A. M., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

SERMON ON SWEARING.

MATT. 5, 33-37.

WHAT WE ARE TO THINK OF SWEARING.

Swearing is an act, the use of which

I. *Since Olden Times has been Considered Unobjectionable by the Lord* 33;

1. Already in the Old Testament it was instituted and practiced by pious men;

2. And has the sanction of the New Testament;

II. *Considered at all Times Holy by the Lord* 33:

Because it

1. Should be calling upon Almighty God as a witness of the truth and avenger of the untruth,

2. It has reference to our salvation, which is lost by wicked swearing,

III. *Considered at Many Times Necessary by the Lord;*

Namely, where it is used

1. To protect one's honor and good name;
2. To rescue the innocent;
3. In the acceptance of an office;
4. To promote the honor of God;

IV. *Considered at Improper Times Sinful* 34–36;

1. Such a time is when swearing
   - *a.* neither tends to God's honor,
   - *b.* nor is asked by the government as the handmaid of God,
   - *c.* but is used in common life and carelessly;

2. The sinfulness rests in this, that in such wicked swearing one
   - *a.* partly takes God's name in vain and profanes it,
   - *b.* partly pledges something which does not belong to him;

V. *Considered in Future to be Unnecessary by the Lord* 37;

Let us ask,

1. When this time comes; it comes when the kingdom of God has advanced so far that truthfulness reigns in all hearts,

2. Why swearing is then unnecessary; the need of solemn asseveration is then gone
   - *a.* from us,
   - *b.* from others;

3. How we should conduct ourselves in the meantime; we should
   - *a.* limit swearing as much as possible, and in daily life avoid it altogether,
   - *b.* always practice the strictest truthfulness.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MATT. 14, 22-34.

"OUR HELP IS IN THE LORD."

We consider in this Gospel lesson,

I. *How the Lord proves Himself to be our Helper;*

1. Now, He does it before threatening danger 22:
   a) For He orders the disciples to depart to protect them from danger;
   b) To protect us from the greater dangers of the soul, He permits the lesser evils of the body to befall us.
2. Again, He comforts the frightened soul 24-27;
   a) Permits it only for a short time to storm around you;
   b) Endure in patience this trial of your faith;
   c) In His good time there will be a blessed end to it.
3. Again, He saves those who are sinking from drowning 28-31;
   a) What made Peter sink;
   b) What saved him from drowning
4. Again, He restrains affliction from without 32;
   a) The dangerous waves were not permitted to destroy them,
   b) But are not said to have subsided suddenly.

II. *Who receives the Help of the Lord;*

Those,

1. Who loudly call upon Him for help, as Peter did 30;
2. Who, without loud prayers are of little faith and do not expect His aid 26, but still are heartily devoted to Him;
3. Who are in some relation to His people, and without any prayer are delivered with them, as the sailors were 33.

III. *What One should give to the Lord for Help;*

One has and manifests to the Lord after every deliverance,

1. Humiliation before His revealed majesty 15,
For we have become conscious
   a) How sinful, weak, and in need of help we are;
   b) How holy, ready and able to help He is.
2. Thankful, true, trustful devotion to Him 34; for from help received we get new strengthening of our faith.

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

LUKE 14, 25–35.

IT REQUIRES A GREAT DEAL TO BE A CHRISTIAN.

In regard to this admonition we consider

I. *To whom it Applies*;

It applies
1. Not to people like those men
   a) From whom the Lord came 1-15;
   b) And whom He described in a parable 16-24;
2. But to people, who 25
   a) Indeed are attached to the Lord,
   b) But are not very determined in following Him.

II. *What Demands it makes;*

It demands from the followers of the Lord
1. All their love for Christ, which 26
   a) Should be greater than love for children, wife, etc,
   b) And they should rather desert those dearest to them, if these are, or are liable to be detrimental to Christianity, than lose Christ,
2. Willing bearing of their cross for Christ's sake, which 27
   a) Is to show itself in determined self-denial,
   b) Is to be practiced under the form of hatred of the world.
3. Fulfilment of the calling of a Christian 28-32
   a) Not blind, over-hasty beginnings,

b) But considerate steadfastness to Jesus for edification in our holy faith;

III. *What Considerations it causes;*

It causes us to consider two things:

1. To be a Christian is
   a) A high, most respectable station comparable to the building of a tower 28
   b) An honorable one, but threatened by powerful enemies 31
   c) A good seasoning for the depraved and tasteless world 34
2. To fall from one's Christian standing is a deplorable thing
   a) To him who falls away, who is much to be lamented 34
   b) For his associates to whom he is no more a benefit, 35, but dangerous.

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MATT. 11, 25-30.

IT IS NOT HARD TO BE A CHRISTIAN.

For

I. *We are so Earnestly Admonished;*

namely by the Savior who gives the strongest incentives to it, because He

1. Is the pious One who prays 25—is himself in the peace of God and can show others the way to this peace;
2. Is the most loving Friend of men 25—considers the welfare of the least of men;
3. Is the most exalted Lord and is thus
   a) The revealer of God's being and will 26;
   b) Partaker of all godly power 27;

II. *We are so Forcibly Urged;*

We are urged

1. Our affliction as long as we are without a Savior,

2. Our misery, in which we in vain try to come to God by our own power,
3. Our heavy burden, as our sins press us to the earth and finally to hell.

III. *We are Promised so much;*

1. In our affliction, comfort;
2. In our misery, strengthening;
3. In our burdened condition, deliverance.

IV. *So Little is Required of us;*

nothing more than

1. To come to Him and so out of the world 28 which occurs in repentance,
2. To come and cleave to Jesus which takes place by faith, and thereby to listen eagerly to Him, who
   a) Meek and lowly loves His own 29;
   b) And puts no heavy and unbearable burdens on them.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

LUKE 7, 36-50.

GRATEFUL LOVE TO THE SAVIOR.

We notice

I. *How it shows itself 36-38;*

This love shows itself in Mary Magdalene

1. In the courage of her faith which she shows 37; for
   a) It is a mighty Lord, whom she approaches;
   b) It is a strange house which she enters;
   c) They are men of higher rank among whom she dares to go.
2. In the sorrowful tears which she sheds 38; they are
   a) Tears of pain and remorse in remembrance of her sinful life;
   b) Tears of love and thankfulness for the forgiveness received from the Lord;
3. In the gift of love which she brings 38: for behold

a) The costly gift;
b) The personal service;
c) Her respectful manner;
d) The purest motive;

II. *What it receives 39-50;*

This love is, as here in the case of Mary Magdalene, differently judged; it is

1. Mistaken and blamed by men 39;
   a) Simon, a self-righteous Pharisee;
   b) She is reproached for her former sins;
2. Recognized and praised by the Lord; here
   a) By the honorable defense of her deed of love before the host 40 and the guests 49,
   b) By the repeated 48 and emphasized assurance of her forgiveness.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

FOR A MISSION FESTIVAL.

MATT. 9, 35-38.

THE EXHORTATION TO LABOR IN GOD'S HARVEST.

We consider, in reference to Foreign and Home Missions,

I. *What Obliges us to Labor;*

1. Respect for the Lord God,
   a) Who desires to harvest the souls of men for His kingdom;
   b) And to do this through the service of men.
2. Obedience to the Savior, who exhorts to it
   a) By His example 35,
   b) By His command 37;
3. Pity for those far from the kingdom of God,
   a) Whose misery is to be pitied 36;
   b) Whose number is great 37;
4. The small number of the first laborers. In regard to this we
   a) Consider whether there were so few on account of disinclination or incompetency;

b) We should take to heart that their fewness should be a motive to us to be all the more faithful laborers.

II. *How we Perform the Labor;*

We

1. Pray the Lord of the harvest to increase the number of laborers 38; that He would make more men
   a) Willing to offer themselves for His work
   b) Competent to accomplish something in His service.
2. Ourselves sincerely do our share in God's harvest field, as true disciples of Jesus 37, so that every one in his calling and station may
   a) Use all diligence to win souls to partake in the mission work;
   b) Show all good faithfulness, so that no remonstrances of the world or our flesh may hinder us,
   c) Pray for the success of mission work 2 Thess. 3, 1.

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

FOR CHURCH DEDICATION.

JOHN 2, 12-17.

HOW IS YOUR ZEAL FOR YOUR HOUSE OF GOD?

We consider,

I. *The Holy Obligation to Zeal:*

These things oblige us to be zealous:

1. The high purpose of the house of God—a house of prayer 16;
2. The heavenly blessings, which it affords us;
3. The pious examples and admonitions of all God's saints.

II. *The right Practice of Zeal;*

We show our zeal in the right way when we

1. Joyfully and diligently attend church ourselves to receive His gifts, and do not allow ourselves to be kept away by
   a) The love of comfort,
   b) The fear of men,
   c) Carelessness concerning our soul's welfare,
   d) Base avarice, which begrudges church gifts;
2. Take those in close connection with us along to church, as Jesus His disciples 17;
3. Point those not in the church to their duty, as Jesus the merchants in the temple 15, 16, and deal with
   a) The malicious and stubborn with severity 15
   b) The thoughtless and misled with mildness 16;

III. *The Blessing of Zeal;*

As a reward for this zeal
1. God is pleased with our faithfulness;
2. The heightening and bettering of our Christian life, for zeal for the church, as is seen in the case of the disciples
   a) Leads to study of the Scriptures 17, and to faith
   b) Produces beneficial thoughts.

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

MATT. 10, 16-20.

HOW SHOULD THE CHRISTIAN CONDUCT HIMSELF TOWARD THE WORLD?

There are according to the Lord's direction three things which He must have:

I. *The Wisdom of Serpents 16;*

According to this we Christians should learn from the serpents in regard to the inimical world 17, 18, thus we should
1. Observe our enemy carefully, that we may
   a) Discover his often obscure wicked purposes and attacks in time;

b) Not, unsuspecting and defenseless be overtaken, deceived, and overcome by him;

2. Determine our conduct rightly, considering
   a) Whether a courageous advance;
   b) Or quiet waiting;
   c) Or retreat for the present is advisable and in place;
3. Pursue our task unceasingly, in such a way that we
   a) Do not feel safe from new attacks after a victory over the enemy;
   b) Do not despair of future victory after being defeated by him.

II. *The Harmlessness of Doves 16;*

According to this we Christians should learn from the doves in regard to the inimical world 17. 18, that we may

1. Show ourselves candid and well-meaning;
   a) Not cunning and sly;
   b) Not selfish, but self-sacrificing;
2. Meet it mildly and humbly,
   a) Not giving offence in word and deed;
   b) Not challenging it by annoyance;
   c) Not getting angry over its delusion;
   d) Not desirous of revenge on account of personal failings;
3. Oppose it with pious diffidence, fearing lest we, in battle with it,
   a) Receive hurt in our own souls;
   b) Injure the Lord's cause.

III. *Trust in God 17-20;*

Through trust in God, the Christian in battle with the inimical world 17. 18

1. Is deprived of fear on account of the number and power of the enemy; for
   a) The enemies are only men 17,
   b) His fighting is a good testimony for his adversaries of the meaning and power of the Gospel 18;

2. Is given courage and joy for defence; for our heavenly Father always gives His children His aid, as He gives them
   a) The right spirit,
   b) The right words.

TWENTY-FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

JOHN 11, 1-16.

THE LORD'S ANSWER TO THE CRY FROM A BED OF SICKNESS.

He answered it

I. *With a Comforting Promise which He caused to precede 1-4;*

We notice of what kind it was
1. In respect to meaning: that the sickness of Lazarus
   a) Was not unto death,
   b) But for the glory of God and His Son;
2. In regard to its power of comforting
   a) In lasting, painful sickness;
   b) And even in the face of approaching, bitter death;

II *With Surprising Delay, which He caused to ensue 5-6;*

We ask
1. What the indication of it was: two days is a long time for those who are waiting and in trouble.
2. Why it was surprising;
   a) Jesus otherwise hastens with His help
   b) Love also admonishes to speedy help;
3. How it is to be explained; those who were well were to be
   a) In the meanwhile exercised in the humility of faith, hope, and prayer;
   b) Afterward all the more overjoyed by the aid which He would bring.

III. *By coming Himself, which He subsequently did 7-16;*
The Lord
1. Is not hindered by the remonstrances of those who think
   a) The journey to the sick-bed to be harmful to the Lord;
   An opinion suggested by the disciples 8
   And refuted by the Lord 9. 10;
   b) That this journey is unnecessary on account of his convalescent sleep; for thus they understand "sleep" 3;
   Which is argued by the disciples 12
   And put aside by the Lord 14
2. But is much more induced to it by love; which rejoices 15
   a) To cut short the time of waiting for the two sisters;
   b) And to give the disciples faith-strengthening which they needed 15, 16 and could and should receive from Lazarus' resurrection.

TWENTY-SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

FUNERAL SERMON.

JOHN 11, 17-40.

WARNING AGAINST INJURY TO OUR SOULS THROUGH SORROW FOR THE DEAD.

Through Sorrow for the Dead, as in the case of the two sisters, it is possible, that

I. *Our Faith may Decrease;*
1. Martha's faith does not become altogether dead 21, 22 but reaches a low ebb 23-26; her lament over her brother is a silent complaint against the Lord 21; her confession of faith is rather of the lips only than of a heart full of faith 24;

2. This repeats itself many times in the life of Christians. In circumstances, as in Matt. 2, 18, faith in God's loving, wise and righteous dealings decreases.

II. *Our Love may Grow Cold;*

1. Mary, whose love was once so warm and heartfelt, does not go to meet the Lord but must be called by the Lord 28 whom she meets respectfully but without her once burning love and like her sister 21 makes a slight reflection 32.
2. Also this repeats itself many times in the life of Christians. Love to the God of love grows cold.

III. *Our Hope may be Extinguished*;

1. The hope of both sisters a few days ago so bright 3, is now on the decline, for both Mary's tears and Martha's words indicate that they are without hope;
2. This, also, repeats itself many times in the life of Christians. When one trouble after another assails us, the tired heart often does not dare to hope anything more. Consider the dark hours in the life of Jacob, David and Job.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XVI. DECEMBER, 1896. No. 6.

WHAT SHOULD BE OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD OTHER CHURCHES?*

BY REV. W. N. HARLEY, CANTON, OHIO.

This question largely solves itself when we get a clear conception of the status of things in the religious world. When once we have a concise definition of our own Church and one just as clear and concise of other churches, then the attitude of Church toward churches will be readily seen. After the relative position of churches is understood, common honesty and fidelity to Christ will demand consistent action, for our attitude should certainly be no other than that of the Church to which we belong. Therefore, at the very threshold of our inquiry, it becomes necessary to learn what our Church is,—in fact, determine whether she be Church or Sect. Both the actual facts and the logic of our position will allow us to give no other reply to such questions than this:

I.

The Lutheran Church is the true visible Church of God.

But when we lay down this proposition we do not mean to make it operative against Christians in other bodies in such a way as to exclude them from the communion of

* Paper discussed by the Lutheran Free Conference at Canton, Ohio.

saints. Far from it. We maintain with the Word of God that whoever believes in our Lord and Savior is His member and consequently a member of the Church. In this, its narrowest sense, the Church is invisible, faith being the bond of union. However, this invisible spiritual body is an organism: it has life and it has a mission. Its life animates the souls of men, and its mission is in the world. Hence, it manifests itself in visible communions called particular churches. These manifestations are either true, or they are not true. Where they are not true they are false. We are therefore driven to make a distinction between true and false visible churches and to learn how to determine which is the true Church. We will not be able to do this on the basis of membership, be it large or small, for the visible church is an open field in which the enemy sows tares. All visible churches are encumbered more or less with hypocrites. Membership is therefore no criterion. We must look for other marks—marks that are infallible tests. Such there are. The Augsburg Confession and the cinsensus of our theologians are one in maintaining that the marks of the true Church are the preaching of God's Word in its purity and the administration of the Sacraments as instituted by Christ. Are these marks found without mutilation in the Lutheran Church? We answer, Yes—thrice yes. She does preach the Word in its purity, not being bound by Judaic legalism nor hindered by pride of reason. She does administer the Sacraments as instituted by our blessed Savior, neither adding nor subtracting aught. Her peerless Confessions are but an exhibition of her fidelity to Word and Sacraments. The Lutheran Church is therefore no sect, but she is the true visible Church of God on earth. This is and ever has been her claim, and it is ours. Those who are of the contrary part must prove from the Word of God that we are wrong. We occupy an historical position which, according to Dr. Krauth, throws the burden of proof upon those who contest our claim.

Centuries have gone by, but the proof has not been advanced. We have said with Jesus, "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil," John 18, 13, and after three and one-half centuries in which no

prophet or apostle has been brought as witness against us, we say once more in the words of the Master: "If I say the truth why do ye not believe?" John 8, 46. Our claim stands unimpaired.

2. But aside from this, the very logic of our position as a Church demands the same claim. There is a logic in the existence of some things from which there is no getting away without surrendering intelligent manhood or dismantling criminal indifference. If we as ministers of the Lutheran Church do not believe she is right we forfeit the ground from under our feet. To maintain the separate existence of a church on doubt is to do violence to sound reason. We have no right to make a distinction where we know no difference. Moreover, it is convicting our own selves of the sin of schism in the Church of our Master whose desire is that we be one. If we say *we think* our Church is right, it does not mend matters; for that betrays an uneasy and unsettled condition of the mind. Such thinking is not believing. If we say: We think our Church is not wrong but other churches may be right, it is not faith at all—it is doubt. We then waive the right to teach any distinctive doctrines, such as the means of grace, when in fact the apostle teaches us to declare the whole counsel of God. Here is the uncertain sound where it should be certain. Here is heralding for God when we are not certain of His message. Reprehensible as it is for a politician to take the stump and advocate what he is not convinced is right, it is even more so for a Gospel minister to mount the pulpit and teach what he is not himself convinced is right beyond doubt, for God is more than Cæsar, and a soul, more than kingdoms. But, to come to the end of this, if we do not hold that our Church is the true Church, we find ourselves in all sorts of anomalous and untenable positions. If we be men of integrity and conviction, there is no escaping the logic of the existence of our Church: to us the Lutheran Church must be the true visible Church of God.

If for one or the other of the foregoing reasons, we say the Lutheran Church is the true Church, a second proposition follows as a sequence, namely this:

II.

All other Christian Churches are sects.

We cannot say our Church is the true visible Church without implying that all who differ from her are wrong. Here we are not drawing the line of demarkation between Church and no Church, but we are distinguishing between the true visible Church and false visible churches. That is the true Church which holds God's Word in its purity and administers the Sacraments as instituted by Christ; those who dissent from her do not do this and are in that sense and to that extent, false churches. These false churches are manifestly not one with the true visible Church, and for that reason they maintain a separatistic existence. Such existence is sectarianism. Hence, each one of the other denominations is a sect, or, to avoid misunderstanding, a separate section of the Church. It is a Christian Church by virtue of whatever saving truth it may still possess; but it is none the less a sect on account of the errors which separate it. In proof of the statement that all other Christian Churches are sects, we need but show how they originated and why they are continued.

1. What brought the sects into existence was, in every instance, their error and not the truth, and above all that as much of it as we hold in common with them. Truth does not exclude truth. In the Church, truth binds, error disrupts. Now, it is beyond controversy, that the peculiar doctrines of other denominations account for their existence. No man can assign any other reason. But every doctrine that separates another denomination or sect from us is a distinctive doctrine; and one and all of these distinctive doctrines are errors or heresies. To illustrate this point and get the matter into the concrete: every dogma that is distinctly Methodistic, Baptistic or Presbyterian is a false doctrine because it separates from the true visible Church and is a mark of an erring church. That this is so, or that the Church has sufficiently proved that the distinctive doctrines of the sects are errors, needs no proof in a Lutheran body where every man's presence is evidence that he believes she has done so. However, this brings us again to the demands of the position we occupy. It is, either

maintain what is here set forth with reference to sects, or surrender; for the very necessities of the case demand that the Lutheran must hold all the distinctive doctrines of all the other denominations to be errors and their organizations sects. To a Lutheran every doctrine that is distinctively Methodistic, Baptistic or Presbyterian must be false. It cannot be otherwise, unless he be a Lutheran in name, but not at heart. Therefore we must say in compliance with the truth and by force of our position as well that error has caused sectarianism.

2. Harsh as it may sound in plain King's English, it is none the less true, that all the other denominations maintain a separate existence for the sole purpose of propagating their peculiar errors. Error was the cause of their separation, and error is the one reason for their continued separation. They hold some truth. We also hold that same truth. For the purpose of disseminating that they would need no separatistic organization. The true Church which existed before them and still exists would answer for that purpose in every respect. But no, in addition to partial truth they hold positive error, and for the sake of propagating that they maintain separate organizations. The sect is needful to them for that purpose only for which they cannot use the Church, and that is the propagation of error. That is the sole reason for which all other denominations maintain their separate existence. This is plain as daylight in practice. Almost any community will furnish an example. Here is a suburb in which Lutherans and Methodists live. We erect a chapel, organize a mission and instal a pastor. Six years later, the Methodists build a church within a stone's throw of ours. Why did they not unite with us in worship and join us in doing the Lord's work? Why erect another edifice, divide energy, spend money and perpetuate division? Was it to preach Christ as we preach Him, that that church was built? No, our congregation and house of worship would have answered for that. Was it built for the purpose of preaching only the truth we hold in common? Again, nay: for our Church's activity precluded such a demand. Why then was the separatistic congregation formed? Why the separate church built? Only for that which is left: *their distinctive Methodistic errors.*

To do the same thing, namely, propagate the errors which they hold, is the sole purpose of sectarian existence from congregation to general bodies. Their every church building is a material witness to the fact. Wood and stone cry aloud against him who attempts to ignore it.

On the other hand, the Lutheran Church is not one of many sects standing on a parity, but she is the true visible Church of God. Her mission in the world is to propagate the truth. Hence, the erring churches militate against her. This brings clearly before us the actual position of Church and churches, and we are enabled to set up a third proposition, to wit:

III.

The attitude of the Lutheran Church toward all sects is that of truth opposed by error.

This is not a position of choice but it is one of necessity. She is confronted by aggressive error which has marshaled its hosts, organized its own armies, openly proclaims truth to be falsehood and cries out into the world that our Church lies and deceives in the name of the Most High. Such is sectarianism. She will compass earth and sea to make a proselyte. By causing the offence of division (Rom. 16, 17) she makes ammunition for the scoffer. Her standing separation is in itself standing opposition and offence. Not to take cognizance of such error would be criminal. But the Church has been true to the requirements of her position. As truth opposes error and refuses to affiliate with it, so has the Church stood in her position toward the sects; for in the first place, She has always testified against them; and in the second place, She has not affiliated with them.

1. It does not require the burning of midnight oil to find that the true Church has always borne her testimony against sects. It demands no long search. The declarations of the apostles relative to sound doctrine, oneness of mind and faith, allusions to heresy and division, are apostolic testimony against sectarianism. Patristic literature has abundant testimony of the same kind. And later, in those dark ages when the early glory of the Church

was obscured and corruption reigned, there were still those who testified for the truth as it is in Christ, and preferred rather to live the life of hounded exiles than curtail their testimony against error in the Church. Luther did likewise. He hurled veritable thunderboltts at abuse and sectarianism. And what is the Augustana itself but the explicit testimony of the Church—testimony for the truth and testimony against error? It affirms a truth and then condemns everything opposed to it, going so far as to name the sects which harbor the opposite error. Post-Reformation history is but another chapter in this volume of testimony. The Church has always testified against sects or other denominations, if it must be so phrased. She has done so by teaching, preaching and publishing. She has even bridled music and vanquished errors with sacred song. Her vast, unexcelled library of positive theology is a monument to Lutheran fidelity to truth and Lutheran testimony against error, and just here an interesting and so far as the practical outcome of this paper is concerned, a weighty fact must be noted. The development of our systematic theology was nearly all brought about by contending for the truth against error. In this matter it has always been the rule of the Church to follow Phillipians 3, 15. 16. She held faithfully to that whereto she had attained and when it became necessary more was revealed to her by God through the development of what she had. So she stood for the truth and when a particular error arose she did not keep silent or shirk duty but she emphasized the particular doctrine opposed to it and developed it toward every side. It was largely in this way that our systematic theology was developed. Dogmas have a history, and that history tells against present day indifference. But this stands fast, the Church has testified against the sects, for she would not see men's souls endangered or God's glory dimmed among men.

2. But did she give her testimony in words only? Was the doctrine one thing and the practice quite another? Nay, the Church has also testified in Confessional acts, for *She has not affiliated with sects.* That each sect maintains a separate existence is in itself ample proof of this assertion. "They went out from us but they were not of us."

If fellowship had been possible there would have been no necessity for disruption. But truth and error are antagonistic and cannot co-operate. If sectarian affiliation should last but one hour, it would be an hour in which testimony was not given against it. For such reasons Luther would not fellowship Zwingli. He did not deny Zwingli's sonship, but held him as an erring brother. And that is the position of the Church in the same matter. It is not only her logical and historical attitude but it is her biblical position, put into practice. St. Paul says Titus 3, 10: "A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject." Young's Bible Concordance, which no man will claim was compiled with a bias for us, defines the word translated "heresy" as "choice, opinion, sentiment." A heretic is a person who holds such opinion, choice, sentiment. St. Paul according to this would therefore say: He who will not submit to the Word which ye have learned, but makes it subservient to his own choice, opinion or sentiment, after the first and second admonition reject. The Church may not hold as her members men who hold their opinion above her Lord's Word, or who exercise choice and believe this and reject that. Yet it may not be an error unto death. Notwithstanding, she will not fellowship them. I anticipate it will be asked: Isn't that intolerant? I pay you back in your own coin and ask: When did truth ever tolerate error? But this is only raising fog. The simple historic fact is that the Lutheran Church never was intolerant. She has never used force. The sects have persecuted and murdered men of other faiths, but the Lutheran Church has done nothing of the kind. To refuse fellowship is not intolerance, neither is it a sin against charity. Although we do not fellowship the sects we do not thereby say they are not Christians and have no rights we are bound to respect. Buf they have erred from the faith. While she recognizes them still as Christians she cannot accord them fellowship on account of error. The apostle says 2 Thess. 3, 14: "If any man obey not our word by this epistle note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed." Here a refusal of fellowship is enjoined. "Yet," he continues in the same sentence, "count him not as an enemy but ad-

monish him as a brother." That in connection with Titus 3, 10 contains the principle of all she claims. While the Lutheran Church holds on biblical grounds that all who believe in Christ are members of the invisible Church she also holds on biblical grounds that she dare not fellowship those who belong to visible erring churches. It ought to be patent to all that rules of action for the visible Church cannot be based on the oneness of the invisible Church, for the simple reason that the visible Church is not one like the invisible Church. So it comes that the Lutheran Church does not affiliate with other denominations but testifies against them and this is her historic attitude. As a Church she has not practiced fellowship. At Marburg Luther would not fellowship Zwingli. On another occasion shortly before his death, he confessed his faith in the article concerning the Lord's Supper and closed it with these words: "Whoever, I say, will not believe this should let me alone, and he need not expect any fellowship with me; for thus stands the sentence which is not to be altered." (Form of Con. N. M. Ed. p. 579). That declares in no uncertain words where the greatest and brainiest Lutheran of all stood on the fellowship question. Those who will not accept the entire "Book of Concord" as their Confession will surely not reject its historical evidence. It registers the convictions of the Church at that time, to say the least. What about affiliation with sects do we find there? Everything against it. In explaining the 8th Art. of the Augustana, which might be misconstrued on this point, the Apology says: "We ought not to hear or receive false teachers," p. 141. That is a rule of practice about as far removed from fellowshiping as anything can be. Again in the Articles of Smaldcald, A. D. 1537, occurs this sentence: "Grievous it is, for a person to separate himself from so many countries and people and to vindicate the doctrine, but here stands the command of God that each one should be on his guard, and not be an accomplice with those who promulgate false doctrines." P. 315. All these quotations, including Luther's emphatic declaration, are part and parcel of the Confessions subscribed to by thousands upon thousands of Lutherans. Affiliation with sects is not a Lutheran practice. Of the

six general bodies in this country, only one, the General Synod, is a unit in favor of pulpit and altar fellowship. The United Synod of the South is divided on this point in practice. The learned Dr. Walther gave this as one of the characteristics of our Church: "The Evangelical Lutheran Church denies all fraternal and church fellowship to those who reject her Confessions in whole or in part." That is beyond doubt the attitude of historic Lutheranism.

If it be asked now, What should be our attitude towards other denominations, the reply is at hand in the fourth thesis:

IV.

We should recognize the attitude of the Church towards sects and act consistently with it.

Her attitude towards them is that of truth opposed by error. True to this position, she has always testified against them and has not affiliated with them. Consistently we can do nothing else. She has found it necessary to testify against them, and fidelity to Christ, to the Church and to souls placed in our care demands that we do the same. This is manifestly against pulpit fellowship with other denominations. Lutheran pulpits are for Lutheran preachers, and Lutheran preachers are for Lutheran doctrines. As ministers of Christ we must declare the whole counsel of God. Jesus tells us to teach men all things whatsoever He commanded us. We dare not suppress any doctrine however distasteful it may be to some or how unpopular it may render us with others. We must also exercise great care as to the doctrinal statements made in our pulpits. Doctrine, pure and sound, is important. St. Paul's injunction to each one of us is: "Speak thou the things which become sound doctrine." Titus 2, 1. "Hold fast to the form of sound words." 1 Tim. 4, 16. Our pulpits are for true doctrine. It is the pure doctrine that has great efficacy. "Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine," says St. Paul, "continue in them: for in doing this, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." 1 Tim. 4, 16. This great caution is not enjoined without reason. Revelation tells us that all teachers of religion will not do this. Our blessed Savior tells us to "Beware of

false prophets." St. Paul declares, "the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine." 2 Tim. 4, 3. St. Peter says there shall be damnable heresies and many shall follow their pernicious ways. 2 Peter 2, 1. 2. Now where there are false prophets it is obvious that there must also be false churches in which they prophesy or teach. It is therefore our duty as watchmen on the walls of Zion to warn, reprove, rebuke, expose, using "Sound speech that cannot be condemned." Titus 2, 8. As faithful ministers of Christ we must oppose error. We must stand with the Church and testify from our pulpits. This we all do more or less.

1. But to practice pulpit fellowship with errorists is virtually nullifying such testimony, for it is saying one thing in word and another in action, and the proverb has it that "actions speak louder than words." If to-day I warn against Methodistic error and to-morrow fellowship a Methodist parson, the edge of that testimony is gone. St. Paul laid down a more consistent and beneficial rule, to wit: "If any man obey not our Word by this epistle, note that man and have no company with him that he be ashamed." 2 Thess. 3, 14. Fellowship with errorists will never shame them and bring them to the truth, but will tend only to strengthen them in their course, because—

2. It is a virtual endorsement of their position. So soon as we begin to fellowship errorists, we cease to testify against them. Standing aloof is the strongest of testimony, even if not a word be uttered. Participation is the direct opposite. On the principle here involved there seems to be little or no dispute between us. *The Lutheran World* of May 4th, 1896, says editorially: "Several Congregational ministers of Boston have recently exchanged pulpits with Unitarian ministers. *This is a virtual endorsement of Unitarianism and will be so regarded.*" So far the quotation. This is an unequivocal endorsement of our principle. The exchange of pulpits with a Unitarian is here declared to be "*a virtual endorsement of Unitarianism.*" If that be true, and we do not question it, why is not the exchange of pulpits with a Methodist a virtual endorsement of Methodism? It is, and it must be so considered. If preaching with fundamental errorists is endorsing fundamental error,

then it must follow that preaching with non-fundamental errorists is endorsing non-fundamental error. The whole thing is then brought down to the question, Is it wrong to endorse any doctrinal error? Without hesitating we reply, it is. We *can* become partakers with other men in sin and error. Where it is done knowingly it is a sin against better knowledge, one of the meanest transgressions in the category.

3. But we must not lose sight of the erring brother in this aspect of the case. Since fellowship is an endorsement of error it is also a sin against brotherly love, for nothing can be more against charity than to do aught that would strengthen and confirm a fellow-being in error.

4. Furthermore, such pulpit fellowship is a confessional act, which is a personal condemnation of the attitude of the Church. It condemns the action of Luther at Marburg Colloquium and all subsequent denominational history which grew out of that crisis.

On the whole, no man can show that pulpit fellowship with sectarians is in harmony with the attitude of the Lutheran Church, which, instead of affiliating with other denominations, emphasized and amplified the true doctrine against them, as little tolerating heresy in her communion as truth tolerates error. Can it not be said, if in some quarters practice be otherwise to-day, that it is not because the spirit of Christ is more prevalent, but because conviction is weaker? The history of Dr. Krauth is here to the point. He was a new-measure Lutheran with a vengeance. But when he grew to be a Lutheran giant in knowledge and conviction, he took the historic position of the Church on this subject of fellowship. It seems to me that the Fathers had as much Christian charity as we have and a good bit more of that "spirit which leads into all truth." At any rate, he who ignores the chasm of sect and clasps hands with error will find no weapon in the armory of historic Lutheranism with which to defend his position.

But it seems to me that pulpit fellowship makes demands which are not only inconsistent with the biblical attitude of the Church but such as no manly man would make if he apprehended the full import of his act. It strikes me that he who invites an errorist into his pulpit

has no ground for remonstrance, if men question his fidelity to the pure Word. On the face of it, it looks reckless. He must not complain, if men say he is at variance with ordination and installation vows, for such is the appearance. Called to a Lutheran pulpit, pledged to Lutheran doctrine he speaks by the mouth of an Arminian or a Calvinistic proxy. In the eyes of unbiased human judgment he who practices pulpit fellowship must stoop—stoop to evil. Ah, you are mistaken, I hear some one say. Nothing is preached save that upon which they agree. That is understood. It is a matter of courtesy. No Christian gentleman would transgress. Then it certainly seems all the worse for the Christian gentlemen in question. What, will a Lutheran minister virtually submit to being gagged? Will he tacitly agree not to bear testimony for God on the very points on which he knows those people need enlightenment? Can he submit his manhood and his sacred office to such requirements? Not with open eyes, I ween. Neither do I believe that he would knowingly require of any man that he for courtesy's sake surrender conviction and freedom of speech for the space of even one half hour. This conduct seems to me all the more amazing when the pulpit fellowship is with that understanding that nothing be taught, except that which is held in common, for there is then no reason for even incurring the appearance of evil (if that were all) by having a man of another denomination preach that which we can or will preach ourselves. The whole thing looks worse than questionable to me. Conviction is made bond-servant to courtesy, and a courtesy, too, at that, which from my point of view would better deserve the name of tyranny.

I hold it to be altogether unnecessary to speak of altar fellowship when the right of pulpit fellowship has been denied. Both pulpit and altar fellowship are out of keeping with the attitude of the Lutheran Church toward other denominations. Her attitude is biblical and it should be that of all her children. Look at it as you will, fellowship is practicing union[ism] where there is no unity; doing what the very building which witnesses the scene cries down; for what do all of the church buildings of other denominations say to us? What say all their inter-jarring

bells with tongues and lips of metal? They say: Your Lutherans are such errorists that we can't unite with you. We must have our own churches. I would to God it were not so; but so it is.

THE EPISTLES OF THOMASIUS.

BY REV. R. C. H. LENSKI, A. M., SPRINGFIELD, OHIO.

INTRODUCTORY.

The writer has been using, in his pulpit-work of late, a few of the series of texts proposed by Nitzsch and by Thomasius. There may be a difference of opinion in regard to the advisability of deviating at all from the regular Gospels and Epistles. After actual trial, however, the writer is convinced that such deviation is by no means objectionable; on the contrary, he finds that the preacher as well as the congregation is greatly profited by an occasional change.

It cannot be denied that the regular Gospels and Epistles, when used year after year without intermission by the average preacher become to a certain extent monotonous to intelligent hearers, and the preacher himself is prone to fall into ruts and tiresome reiterations. A change of texts will stimulate hearer and preacher alike. Diligent Bible readers often desire to hear certain texts outside of the regular Gospels and Epistles treated in the pulpit, and some of the very finest passages of Scripture are offered for such treatment in the new sets of texts proposed by Nitzsch and by Thomasius. We refer especially to a long line of texts taken from the Acts, to a number from Revelations, and to a few of the choicest portions in the Evangelists, as for instance: Christ the True Vine, the Prodigal Son, Martha and Mary, the Raising of Lazarus, etc. Pulpit-work on these texts is far more difficult than on the old Gospels and Epistles. There are but few helps, beside the regular commentaries, on these new texts. G. C.

Deichert has sermons on the Gospels, Epistles and Old Testament texts of Nitzsch; Otto Frobenius a volume on the Gospels of Thomasius; W. Caspari a volume of studies on the Epistles of Thomasius; and J. L. Sommer a volume of studies on the Gospels of Thomasius. These are all the regular aids the writer has been able to find. They are all in German. But it is a good thing to take the dictionary to hand and carve out your own blocks for sermon-building, instead of taking them ready made from the vast piles gathered by other biulders. Independent Bible mining is always exceedingly profitable. And after a year's work of this kind on new texts the preacher will go back to the old Gospels and Epistles with a wider range, a richer fund of knowledge, a fresh amount of vim and vigor.

The following sermon-sketches are the result of a year's work on the Epistles of Thomasius. Caspari's studies have been faithfully utilized; they contain a little too much of Hoffmann's peculiarities in exegesis. The newness of these texts and the difficulties they contain for the preacher must help excuse many of the faults and shortcomings of these skeletons. Yet when one goes to work on such new texts, he is glad of the opportunity of examining even inferior work on them.

Thomasius has at times put brief headings to the texts he selected. They are reproduced below, but will be found so brief and sometimes so enigmatic that they furnish only slight suggestions for the treatment of the texts concerned. One of the chief excellencies of these as well as of all newer series of texts is their chain-like character. They link one into the other, and make a whole when finished. To treat them as links, hinging one upon the other, will, of course, require especial care and study; but any measure of success attained will be highly prized by him who desires to do complete work and to proclaim the entire counsel of God unto salvation.

FIRST ADVENT.— Rev. 1, 4–8.

Introductory Note.—This text points us to what we have this Advent morning and shall have throughout the entire church year. We behold here the person of our

Lord and Savior, in its glory and greatness, in its eternity and unchangeable power, in its infinite grace and truth. And more than this, we have and enjoy the blessed fruits of this person's saving work in us; we have grace and peace from Him who is everlasting and changeless, a faithful testimony in His sure Word, and an unchangeable government and rule for our good at His almighty hands; we have His atoning blood, and the washing of our sins in this blood; we have a glorious kingship and priesthood in our adoption and elevation to God-ward; we have a shining hope before us in His assured coming and judgment, and in His everlasting heavenly enthronement and the consummation of His work. This text is admirably suited for the day. Thomasius has written for its heading: "He which is, and was, and is to come." This draws especial attention to the person standing before us in the text, but we find His work and the fruits of His work for us equally prominent.

Introduction.—Advent, a new church-year. Time and change. Christ above both, changeless in His love, conducting all things to their glorious end. We linked to Christ by faith, led by Him unto a glorious eternity.

OUR INESTIMABLE ADVENT BLESSINGS.

We have

I. *An Everlasting King of Grace and Truth.*

a) Him who is, and was, and is to come; the Alpha and Omega; the beginning and the ending.
b) A faithful Witness.
c) The Firstbegotten of the Dead.
d) The Prince of the kings of the earth.
e) The everlasting Judge.
f) Him who is worthy of glory and dominion, of all praise, worship, and exaltation in heaven and on earth.

II. *A Priceless Fund of Heavenly Gifts.*

a) The gift of His Word, wherein the faithful Witness speaks to us; wherein the Firstbegotten offers us

life and release from death; wherein the Prince of kings offers us peace and joy beneath His scepter.

b) The gift of His saving love, of His bloody atonement, of the washing away of our sins.

c) The gift of grace, the untold blessings of God's graciousness; and of peace, the sweet and confident rest of the soul in the sunshine of His favor.

d) The gift of kingship, and of priesthood.

e) The gift of hope in His coming, in His everlasting enthronement, in the consummation promised for the last day.

Blessed are we who pass from the old into a new church-year beneath such a Lord, enjoying such an inexhaustible fund of heavenly gifts.

SECOND ADVENT.—1 Tim. 6, 11–16.

Introductory Note.—Thomasius has headed this text: "The Appearing of Christ at the Last Day." This Sunday is usually made to refer to Christ's second coming. The text gives more than the promise of the second Advent; its burden is surely the sum of the admonitions bidding us to walk in the light of Christ's appearing.

Intro.—The unbelieving foolhardy world denies Cnrist's coming and walks on in sin unto the judgment of damnation; the sleeping, careless, dilatory Christian forgets or disregards Christ's coming and puts his soul in jeopardy.

"BUT THOU, O MAN OF GOD!"

I. *Remember evermore thy heavenly goal.*

a) God, He and His throne on high are the goal of every man of God.

b) Eternal life (v. 12), ours now to lay hold of, ours in heaven to possess and enjoy fully, absolutely.

c) The appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, the second Advent.

d) Immortality and divine light, which we are to share with the only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords.

II. *Keep carefully the way of life.*

a) "Flee."
b) "Follow after."
c) "Fight."
d) "Lay hold."
e) "Keep" (14).
f) Look ever to Jesus and His appearing.
g) Hope ever and long for His gifts on yonder day.

Behold, the glorious goal, see the way leading thither! "Honor and power everlasting" to Him who set this goal before us and would now lead us on the way to reach it!

THIRD ADVENT.—ROM. 2, 12–16.

Introductory Note.—Thomasius' heading for this text is: "The Voice of Conscience." We have spoken of our Advent blessings and of our Advent duties. Christ's first Advent brought us all our blessings, Christ's second Advent sets before us all our duties. And now comes the voice of conscience. As John heralded Christ's first coming to perform the work of salvation, so, after a manner, conscience heralds His second coming unto judgment. Conscience drives us to Christ, that by clinging to Him we may prepare for Him.

Intro.—Advent-preachers: the prophets of Israel, John the Baptist; to-day, your own conscience.

YOUR OWN CONSCIENCE AN ADVENT-PREACHER.

The voice of conscience

I. *Binds you irrevocably fast to the Law.*

a) We would like to emancipate ourselves from the Law.—The prodigal son; prodigals of to-day; the heathen without the law.

b) Conscience prevents this emancipation.—It will not die; when smothered it rises again; even the heathen heard its voice.

c) Conscience binds us to the right and condemns the wrong.—This, whether we will or no; the work of the Law written even in heathen hearts.

d) Give ear to the voice of conscience.—Not to a darkened conscience, as was that of the heathen; not to a perverted conscience, as was that of the Pharisaic Jew; but to a truly enlightened conscience, as is that of a living Christian.

II. *Accuses and condemns you completely as a transgressor of the Law.*

a) Conscience sometimes excuses us.—When we follow the right; it does this often before the judgment of men; but never, when fully enlightened, before the Lord and His Law.

b) Conscience judges and condemns us utterly.—Wrong contemplated; wrong completed (Adam, the malefactor). Remorse; despair.

c) Conscience a prelude to the last judgment.—The last complete judgment will be confirmed by conscience; remorse and despair, begun here, will pass then into utter and eternal bitterness.

III. *Drives you powerfully to Him who has redeemed us from the Law.*

a) Hear the voice of conscience and repent.—Escape remorse and despair by repentance.

b) Hear the voice of conscience and believe in Christ.—His atonement for sin; His righteousness in fulfilling the Law for us.

c) Hear the voice of conscience and seek after holiness.—Embracing forgiveness and clothed in Christ's righteousness, take of His strength and follow in His footsteps.

FOURTH ADVENT.—1 Cor. 26–29.

Introductory Note.—The light of Christmas must illuminate this text. Place the manger into the heart of it, and you have the sermon for the day. This doubtless is what Thomasius meant when he placed the words: "Humiliation and Exaltation" for its heading. There seems to be no clear and clean-cut connection between the four texts for the four Advent Sundays. It may be connection enough, however, between this and the foregoing text to say that the former drives us to Christ, and the present shows us what to expect from Christ.

Intro.—Christmas before us. False expectations in coming to Christ. Let none such possess us.

CHRIST'S CHRISTMAS PRINCIPLES.

We may learn them from our text,

I. *When we look into Christ's manger.*

The principles stated in verses 27 and 28.

a) God hath chosen the foolish things of the world, etc.—How foolish to the world the birth of God's Son, conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of a virgin; in reality how infinitely wise this miracle of the Incarnation.

b) God hath chosen the weak things of the world, etc. —How weak this babe, how weak His appearance throughout, in the eyes of the world; how mighty in reality: God's Son, the Anointed of the Spirit, the Conqueror of the Serpent, the Prince of Life.

c) God hath chosen the base things of the world.—How base and lowly this babe, this Savior throughout, Is. 53, in the eyes of the world; how exalted in reality.

II. *When we look beyond Christ's manger.*

The principles stated in verse 26.

a) Look at the Church.—Corinth and the Christians there; our churches to-day. The proud, worldly-wise, great are found in the lodges, clubs, theaters,

pleasure-halls. Only a few of the world's great men in the Church. Note the fact and the principle.

b) Be not troubled or confused.—As were the Corinthians, who sought philosophic greatness; as are many to-day, who forsake the lowliness of the Church. Remember Christ's true greatness, and that of His true followers.

c) Conform your mind to God's.—He indeed calls all; they who are rich and full according to their own vain imagination heed Him not; they only who feel and see their poverty and distress come and take of His salvation. It cannot be otherwise. Verse 29.

III. *When we look up from Christ's manger.*

Look up to yonder day, when all the glorious principles of God shall be justified forever.

a) Behold Christ's eternal exaltation.
b) Behold the world's eternal degradation.
c) Behold your own eternal elevation.

CHRISTMAS.—Heb. 1, 1–6.

Introductory Note.—This is an old Christmas text; it was used for the third day of the festival, the celebration lasting that long in Germany. It receives first place in this series of texts. Our attention is drawn here not merely to the time and place and circumstances of the divine birth; the text goes back through the preceding ages, back to eternity. It lifts the veil from the manger and shows us the glory of Him who slumbers there. All that our text thus declares is still hidden from our mortal eyes, but it shall be made manifest at the last day. From the manger at Bethlehem we therefore look back to eternity and forward to eternity. Our aim must be to obtain a true and complete view of the Incarnate One. Thomasius has no heading for this text.

Intro.—The glory of Christmas—for eyes of faith. Behold,

THE DIVINE GIFT AT BETHLEHEM.

I. *The promised Savior.*

a) The long time of the prophets, verse 1.—The longing; the promises and prophecies; Christ's word: Kings and prophets desired to see what you see, etc.

b) The gift sent at last in Bethlehem.—The child and Son; the Servant of God; the Prophet like Moses; the Highpriest after whom none other should come; the King promised David. All these promises fulfilled the night of Jesus' birth.

II. *The Eternal Son.*

a) See the divinity of His being.—Greater than the prophets; more excellent in inheritance and name than the angels, verse 4; "the Son," verses 2 and 5 of the same essence as the Father. A human child and yet the eternal Father's eternal Son.

b) See the divinity of His glory.—"The brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person": in and through Christ the Father hath showed Himself to us as He could show Himself through no prophet or angel. He showed Himself as an infinite depth of love and compassion. We can never receive more, God cannot give more.

c) See the divinity of His works.—"Upholding all things by the word of His power": creation and preservation. "By Himself purged our sins and sat down at the right hand": restoring the fallen world.

III. *The allmerciful Redeemer.*

a) Redemption as declared in the promises.—In the first and in the last. Before it was actually completed God treated it as a reality, for it could not fail.

b) Redemption as now actually begun in Bethlehem.—Birth, the first step; He who by Himself, by His blood, purged our sins, here took flesh and blood. The birth an assurance of all that followed.

c) Redemption as we behold it to-day.—We look back upon it completed; possessing and enjoying all its fruits, we praise the beginning, the Incarnation.

IV. *The heavenly King of salvation.*

a) A King in the manger.—Worshiped as such by the Magi, by the angels. Verse 5.

b) The King of all these ages past.—His word before Pilate; before Caiaphas: "The Son of Man coming in the clouds," omnipotent power and judgment; His kingly promises to the Church; His kingly rule till to-day.

c) The King in all His glory on yonder day.—His heavenly exaltation; the manifestation of His glory at the world's end. Everlasting worship.

SECOND CHRISTMAS DAY.—1 JOHN 1, 1–4.

Introductory Note.—The foregoing text centered in the person of the new-born Savior. This text treats of the effect of His coming into the world; it takes the effect in its totality: He is the life. There is no heading for this text.

Intro.—The world dead in sin, like Ezekiel's field of dry bones. God sent it Life in His wondrous way. Christ: "I am the Life."

THE LIFE THAT CAME INTO THE WORLD AT BETHLEHEM.

I. *Behold its coming.*

a) It was from the beginning with the Father.

b) It was heard of old in the prophecies.

c) It was seen and manifest when Christ was born, lived, and labored on earth.

d) It was looked upon and handled (received and appropriated) by the apostles.

e) It was witnessed, showed and declared (proclaimed and offered) through their testimony to others.

f) It comes now to us through this same ancient, unimpeachable, inerrant, divinely effective and operative testimony as found in the Scriptures and proclaimed by truthful preaching.

II. *Mark its effect!*

It is

a) A life that takes us and lifts us from the death of sin and separation from God.
b) A life that enters into us and makes us truly alive, children and heirs of God and salvation.
c) A life that unites us in living fellowship with the Father and the Son.
d) A life that links us together with all the living (believers).
e) A life that brings us full joy here and hereafter.

SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS.—2 TIM. 4, 3–8.

Introductory Note.—This text, coming as it does on the Sunday following Christmas, requires a treatment similar to that in the regular texts for the second Christmas day, the stoning of Stephen. Thomasius has written over it: "Warfare and Crown." It is an excellent text for the day.

Intro.—A mighty contrast; the breath of angel-wings—the clash of swords; heavenly anthems—wail of dying children; the bright light of joy—the dull gloom of sorrow; the delight of life—the seriousness of death. The festival of the heavenly birth—the festival of the first martyr's death; the announcement of the Savior's coming—the announcement of this great apostle's going. Christmas joy—Christianity's seriousness.

OUR CHRISTMAS JOYS BRING SERIOUS DUTIES.

I. *The duty of holding fast sound doctrine.*

a) All the blessings of the Incarnation are garnered in the Word of Truth, in sound doctrine. (Examples of these doctrines).

b) The antagonism of the world against these doctrines and Him who is their soul and center—Herod, the Pharisees, Caiaphas, Pilate, Paul's enemies—man's lusts, itching ears, love of fables.

c) The duty, arising for us, of holding fast sound doctrine—Timothy; the Christian preacher; the Christian congregation and individuals (verse 5).

II. *The duty of fighting the good fight of faith.*

a) All the treasures flowing from the Incarnation are ours through faith. We must receive the doctrine and its blessed contents with believing hearts to make them ours personally.

b) The foes that would rob us of these treasures by antagonizing our faith—impenitence; neglect of the Word and Sacraments; slackness in prayer; love of the world; mere outward Christianity.

c) The serious duty, devolving upon us, to fight the good fight of faith—with Christ's help; by prayer; use of the means of grace; with all our might.

III. *The duty of waiting for the crown of righteousness.*

a) The beginning is not yet the end—faith the beginning, the crown on yonder day the end.

b) The time intervening—long (many old); dark (many depressed, Paul in bonds); full of snares and temptations (many fallen). A time to test us.

c) The serious duty laid upon us to wait in steadfastness and patience—look beyond; think ever of the crown; spurn earthly entanglements; be faithful; let longing and hope increase. The glorious end comes fast.

NEW YEAR'S DAY.—JAMES 4, 13–17.

Introductory Note.—This text has no heading. It is the second text set for this day by Thomasius, the first being Heb. 13, 8, which is a part of the text for the Reformation Festival. We choose the second choice of Thomasius, it contains truths exceedingly necessary for our people to-day.

Intro.—"A Happy New Year!" The world bases its wishes and hopes on "good fortune," on "good luck," chance. The Christian hopes and prays for blessings, and looks for them at the hand of God. Therefore let us say to-day:

"IF THE LORD WILL."

It is a word

I. *Often forgotten in the change of years.*

a) By the unbelieving world. Men make their plans and expect their gains and success without God and God's will. They ascribe their failures to circumstances and evil chances. All without God—the business world of to-day.

b) By superstitious fools. They look to signs and omens instead of looking to the Lord; they believe clairvoyant lies sooner than the assurances of God.

c) By careless Christians. They let prayer and trust in God enter their every-day affairs too little.

II. *Brought back to our memory this New Year's Day.*

a) Our life is entirely in God's hands.—We know not what shall be on the morrow (three examples from occurrences in the past year in the congregation, a young moulder badly burned with liquid metal, a young woman found dying in the morning, a father struck by a wheel crushing his foot).—God alone knows and is able to turn all things for our good.

b) Our life can be exalted by God alone.—We are a vapor—the folly of rejoicing in our boasting—the millions that lie dead and forgotten in the dust of earth—God alone able to give us abiding life, an everlasting place in heaven.

III. *Set for our motto during all the years to come.*

a) In humility—instead of boasting, look humbly to God.

b) In prayer—"Thy will be done."

c) In obedience—not only avoiding all evil, but also omitting no good day by day, till the everlasting New Year dawns.

SUNDAY AFTER NEW YEAR.—Acts 19, 1–7.

Introductory Note.—It would be fruitless to enter into a discussion on the relation between John's baptism and Christ's baptism. The fruitful thought in the text is undoubtedly this: We dare not rest content with imperfect beginnings, we must go forward unto the full possession and enjoyment of God's gracious gifts. Thomasius has no word to indicate his reason for the choice of the text.

Intro.—The blade, the ear, the wheat in the ear, thirty, sixty, a hundredfold. Similar passages of Scripture. It is not how little can we get through with, but how much can we obtain and enjoy.

John's disciples beginners, led on to the full possession of Christ's grace through the efforts of St. Paul. We are to be led in the same way. Let us so treat the question:

"UNTO WHAT THEN WERE YE BAPTIZED?"

A question addressed

I. *To all who have been baptized.*

a) In the name of the Lord Jesus—through whom, however young, weak, ignorant, insignificant we are, we are nevertheless children and heirs of God. (Paul despised not these 12 disciples of John, so do not thou one of these little ones).

b) In the name of the Lord Jesus—in whose knowledge we must grow day by day, if we would not lose the grace of Baptism. (How these 12 would have fallen from the grace they had, if they had resisted Paul).

II. *To all who have been admitted to Communion.*

a) In the name of Christ who suffered and died for us and rose again, etc.—The baptized are to be led up to the second sacrament; the fuller knowledge absolutely necessary.

b) In the name of Christ who suffered, etc.—The deepening and broadening and exalting of this knowledge with every new Communion; so that the wind of doctrine, the deceitful craftiness of men, the lies of sin may be resisted, the church-life become what it should, and each young communicant be able any and everywhere to give a reason for the faith that is in him.

III. *To all who have long enjoyed Baptism and Communion.*

a) In the name of Christ, the soul and center of all Scriptures.—Perfect Christian manhood in all its different phases.

b) In the name, etc.—The exercise of this manly strength in building the kingdom, stopping the adversary's mouth, etc.

"Thou good and faithful servant."

EPIPHANY.—1 JOHN 3, 1–6.

Introductory Note.—The texts from the Sunday after New Year on, down to the sixth Sunday after Epiphany, form a whole, and their chain-like character is easily recognized. We place the brief headings of them all together:

Sunday after N. Y: Our Baptism.
Epiphany: Our Sonship.
1st S. after E.: "The Word, Preaching, Faith."
2d S. after E.: "Christ the End of the Law, Justification."
3d S. after E.: "Our Position and Condition as Believers."
4th S. after E.: "Our Walk in Light."
5th S. after E.: "Our Walk in Love."
6th S. after E.: "Our Walk in Holiness."

To be sure, each of these texts reaches out beyond the one point which it is meant to illustrate especially. A treatment that would take up text for text without regard to the special point for which each is chosen, would

most probably produce a miserable jumble, where there should be sweet harmony. The Epiphany series is especially rich and beautiful. Generally we do not have all the six Sundays after Epiphany. Instead of dropping the texts for the Sundays that do not appear in the calendar, it is profitable to work them in as evening texts.

The Epiphany Festival is used by many as a Mission Festival. This use, however, is not established. Some of the old texts do not support it. Moreover the Festival generally falls on a week-day, and this at a time of the year when a Mission Festival, as we are accustomed to celebrate it, would be a difficult undertaking. The new series of texts do not treat Epiphany as a Missionary Festival. In fact, this is one of the few faults of these texts, they do not provide especial texts for the subject of missions, as we would like to have them; the same thing, however, is true of the old Gospels and Epistles. We are therefore constrained to supply the needs of our Church at the proper time by introducing texts of our own. The missionary element in the present series is abundant enough. If this is brought out properly when it occurs throughout the year, and if for the Children's Missionary Day in June and for the autumn Mission Festival proper free texts are introduced, the subject of mission work will be amply taken care of.

Intro.—"Sons of God," meaning of the term.

"WE ARE CALLED THE SONS OF GOD."

Consider therefore:

I. *Our present condition.*

a) We are no longer slaves of sin and Satan.
b) God's love redeemed us, brought us to faith, gave us adoption.
c) Our sonship lifts us far up beyond the world which is separated from God.

II. *Our future prospects.*

a) "It doth not yet appear what we shall be"—the glory of our sonship still hidden.

b) Let us be satisfied and untroubled, for the day of revelation comes fast.

c) We shall then be like God and Christ, possess perfectly His glorious image.

III. *Our consequent duties.*

a) If we are sons of God and shall be made like unto Him, we must purify ourselves, even as He is pure.

b) If we are God's own, we dare not live in transgression of God's Law, for this would break our relation to God.

c) If we belong to God and Christ who came to take away our sin, we must not continue in sin, we must put off sin by His help, otherwise we cannot abide in the Redeemer from sin and know Him as His own.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.—ROM. 10, 12–21.

Introductory Note.—Thomasius wrote for this text: "The Word, Preaching, Faith." These three might be taken as the three parts of a sermon on the text. A strong missionary element appears here.

Intro.—Christ made full preparation, and then commanded: "Go ye into all the world," etc. Eternal wisdom prepared its tables, the Son's wedding feast ready. O that all would accept the invitation!

THE SAD COMPLAINT OF GOD'S MESSENGERS: "LORD, WHO HATH BELIEVED OUR REPORT?"

I. *In this complaint God is justified.*

a) God's grace is rich over all without a difference.

b) God's means of grace are perfectly sufficient for all. (All can call upon Him, for He gives faith; all can believe, for He gives hearing; all can hear, for He sends preachers).

c) God's gracious invitation extends to all, verses 18 and 20.

II. *In this complaint men are utterly condemned.*

a) They will not believe the report of God's messengers. (in the time of Moses, of Isaiah, of Christ, of Paul, of the present age).

b) Why they refuse to believe. They refuse to submit to the Gospel which takes all alike as sinners and makes like provision for the salvation of all. They refuse to submit to the order of the Gospel: sending, preaching, hearing, believing, calling upon the Lord, receiving salvation.

III. *In this complaint we should be acquitted.*

a) Let each of us recognize the unspeakable riches of God's grace as for us.

b) Let each of us joyfully climb the ladder of salvation: receive the messengers, hear the preaching, etc.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.—ROM. 10, 1–11.

Introductory Note.—The caption of this text is: "Christ the End of the Law, Justification." There are difficulties in this text, yet the articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiæ stands out in it full and clear.

Intro.—Tremendous differences: of race, language, lands, customs, arts, social grades; the ages (Adam, Noah, Abraham, Israel, apostolic times, Middle Ages, Reformation, modern times).

The wonderful wisdom of God, preparing one salvation fitting and sufficient and efficient for all; like the sun shining over all the world and lighting all alike.

"THE WORD OF FAITH WHICH WE PREACH."

I. *It abolishes justification by our own works.*

a) The Jewish zeal without knowledge, "going about to establish their own righteousness," through the impossible work of fulfilling the Law themselves.

b) The blind folly of those who would do Christ's work over again, go into heaven by their own work and bring righteousness down, or into the deep to bring righteousness up.

c) The contemptible trust in civil righteousness, on the strength of which many pronounce themselves "all right."

d) The blasphemous presumption which laughs at those who seriously work for righteousness and in all its sins and crimes pronounces itself fit for heaven.

II. *It establishes justification through Christ's work.*

a) Christ's work.

1. He fulfilled the law, is the end of the Law; this fulfillment complete and ready for us to receive.
2. He came from above and went into the deep; with heavenly power He went into death to atone for our sins by His blood.
3. He put His righteousness into the Word, that there we might find it and make it our own.

b) Justification through Christ's work.

1. With the heart man believeth unto righteousness (faith in the heart).
2. With the mouth confession is made unto salvation (justifying faith confesses).

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.—ROM. 5, 1–5.

Intro.—A mighty difference between the believer and the unbeliever.

THE PRICELESS FRUITS OF JUSTIFICATION.

I. *Peace with God.*

a) The sinner at war with God, and God with him.

b) Christ's atonement made peace possible.

c) By justification, by faith in Jesus Christ, we enter into peace with God.

d) The blessedness of this relation.

e) Being at peace with God we have constant access to His grace.

f) The objective condition of peace becomes the source for the feeling of peace.

II. *Hope of the glory of God.*

a) When we look to God on high, who has justified us, with whom we are at peace; He will glorify us.

b) When we look upon the tribulations of earth below. They trouble us not, but help to perfect our hearts and raise our hope through Christ, producing patience, experience, hope.

c) When we look into our own hearts, where God shed abroad His love; as the Holy Ghost wrought love in our hearts, so He will continue to work in us till our utmost hope is fulfilled.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.—1 JOHN 1, 5–10.

Intro.—The world thinks it is in the light and enlightened when it sets the Gospel aside and turns from the Light of the world and the God of light whom He has revealed. We not so.

THE CHILDREN OF THE GOD OF LIGHT WALK EVER IN THE LIGHT.

I. *What is light?*

a) "Light" is holiness.

b) Its opposite is "darkness," sin.

c) There can be no degree of fellowship between "light" and "darkness" ("no darkness at all").

II. *What does it mean to walk in the light?*

a) It means to walk in fellowship with the God of light—to let Him fill our hearts, His holy will rule our thoughts, words, and acts.—It is impossible to be in fellowship with Him, and still to walk in darkness, love and live on in sin; that would be living in a lie and doing the untruth.

b) It means to live in fellowship with the children of light, "one with another," verse 7.—The companionship of those who are in the light, their separation from the children of darkness and the ways of darkness.—It is impossible to walk in the light, and be separate from the children of light, and hold fellowship with the children of darkness (viz: the lodge).

III. *How about our sins and walking in the light?*

a) The fact remains, that we, the children of light, still have sins.—Its denial is a lie and a crime against ourselves, self-deception; it is furthermore a blasphemous contradiction of the Word, a declaration that God is a liar, i. e. that all His grace and gracious redemption is a falsehood.—This includes every denial of sin, in whole or in part, all self-righteousness, and especially the notion, that sin is a necessity of nature and therefore without guilt, or really no sin.

b) Although we still sin, this sin and darkness in us is at once removed, when we confess our sins; for the blood of Christ cleanses us constantly, if we remain in Him. Rom. 8, 1; 8, 33. 34.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.—1 JOHN 4, 1–17.

Intro.—Brotherly love in the world, lodgery, a broken, shattered branch from the Christian tree. A brotherhood without the true Father, without the chief Brother. So much greater the necessity of understanding true brotherly love, as the Gospel teaches and enkindles it.

"BELOVED, LET US LOVE ONE ANOTHER!"

I. *The source of Christian love.*

a) "Love is of God"—"God is love."

b) God manifested His love in sending His only begotten Son.

c) God's love and Christ's mission, "that we might live through Him," made this love possible for us.

d) When we confess Jesus (verse 15), when we know and believe the love of God, our hearts, drawing from the fountain of love, are able to experience and extend love.

II. *The necessity of Christian love.*

a) He that loveth not, knoweth not God, is not of God.
b) If we love one another God dwelleth in us, and His love is perfected in us.
c) Our love is a sure testimony that we are of God, that we truly believe and confess Christ, that His Spirit is in us.
d) This love is not the natural love of kin or friends, which because man is rational, is only a degree higher than the love of animals; it is love for God's and Christ's sake, kindled by His love, possible only where He dwells in the heart, far above mere natural affection.

III. *The manifestation of Christian love.*

a) The first and real object of God Himself.
b) Its second and mediate object, "one another," because we cannot see God, because God dwells in the brethren, because we must love whom God loves.
c) The character of the brethren dare not influence the extension of this love; their weakness, faults, unworthiness cannot check the outflow of Christian love, as it checks not the outflow of God's love.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.—1 PETER 1, 13–21.

Intro.—How little holiness is sought after; many barely escape the fiery pit. How mightily the Scriptures urge holiness; how high the degree they demand.

"BE YE HOLY!"

I. Because God is holy.
II. Because ye no longer belong to the world (v. 14).

III. Because ye are bought with Christ's blood.
IV. Because ye go forward to the judgment.
V. Because a glorious goal is set before you (v. 13).

(To be continued.)

PRIVATE CONFESSION.

BY REV. O. S. OGLESBY, A. M., PITTSBURG, PA.

I. Private confession is neither commanded nor forbidden in the Holy Scriptures, and it, therefore, belongs to the Adiaphora.

By private confession we understand the personal confession of the individual penitent, and the direct and personal application of the words of absolution to such a penitent sinner by the confessor. Private confession, as thus defined, does not require the penitent to enumerate or specify every particular sin. To make such requirement of men, as the Roman Catholic Church does in her doctrine of confession, is unscriptural, unreasonable, and distressing, and in direct conflict with the Confessions of our Church.

Such requirements are unscriptural, according to Psalm 19, 12, "Who can understand his errors? Cleanse Thou me from secret faults." Also Psalm 40, 12, "Innumerable evils have compassed me about." Jeremiah 17, 9, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" They are unreasonable, for it is unreasonable to ask, or to expect men to reveal all the secrets of their hearts unto their fellow-men, and not infrequently to those in whose judgment and honesty they have no confidence. It is distressing to conscience, for it is to acknowledge a human lordship over conscience, and renders true peace impossible.

Such requirements are also in direct conflict with the Confessions of our Church, as is expressly declared in the 11th Article of Augsburg Confession. "In confession, however, it is unnecessary to enumerate all transgressions

and sins, which indeed is not possible." Psalm 19, 12. Again, in the 25th Article it is written, "Of confession our Churches teach that the enumeration of sins is not necessary, nor are consciences to be burdened with the care of enumerating all sins, inasmuch as it is impossible to recount all sins, as the Psalm 19, 12 testifies: 'Who can understand his errors?' " He who is willing to know the truth can readily learn that private confession is not *required* by either the Holy Scriptures, or the Confessions of the Lutheran Church. But, if it is evident that private confession is not commanded by the Holy Scriptures, or by theConfession of our Church, it is equally evident that it is not forbidden by either of these acknowledged authorities of our Church.

While we cannot find any command in the Word of God rendering private confession obligatory upon us, we do find numerous examples showing us that private confession is a *privilege* granted unto all whose troubled conscience leads them to seek this means of instruction and comfort. Such an example we find in the history of David and Nathan, as recorded in 2 Sam. 12, 1-14. Also in the history of of the man sick of the palsy, as given in Matt. 9, 1-8. As also in the history of the woman, "which was a sinner," as given in Luke 7, 36-50.

That private confession is a privilege granted unto all penitent sinners, is clearly maintained in our Confessions. In the Augsburg Confession, Article 11th, we read: "In reference to confession it is taught, that private absolution ought to be retained in the Churches." In the 25th Article we read: "Confession is not abolished in our Churches. For it is not usual to communicate the body of our Lord, except to those who have been previously examined and absolved." The same truth is expressed in the 6th Article of the Apology, as also in the Smalcald Articles, Article 8th.

There is, indeed, a twofold confession of sin *binding* upon us, namely, a confession of sins to God alone, Prov. 28, 13, Lord's Prayer, 5th petition, and a confession in which one confesses to his fellow-man any wrong he may have done him, Matt. 18, 15. But this is more properly called "a common confession for all Christians." Larger Catechism. "Besides this useful, daily, and open confes-

sion, there is also a confession which may take place privately between two brothers. And if, from some special cause, we become disturbed with restless anxiety, and find our faith insufficient, we can make our complaint to a brother in this private confession, and obtain his advice, comfort, and support, whenever we desire. For this confession is not embraced in a command, like the other two, but is left optional with every one who needs it, to use it to his necessity." Larger Catechism. This latter is what we understand as private confession, and which we maintain is neither commanded nor forbidden by the Word of God, and that it is, therefore, a matter of Christian liberty which every one is privileged to enjoy, but to which no one can be forced by authority.

II. Private confession is not an essential mark of a truly Lutheran congregation, and therefore those Churches where it has fallen into disuse or has never been introduced, should not, on that account, be denied Christian fellowship.

Those things which belong to the Adiaphora can never be made an essential mark of a true Lutheran congregation. The true and infallible marks of the holy Christian Church are two, viz. "the pure preaching of the Word of God and the legitimate administration of the Sacraments which God instituted." Dietrich's Cate. Qu. 301. "It is sufficient for the unity of the Church to agree in the Gospel and in the administration of the Sacraments, and human ordinances need not everywhere be uniform." Book of Concord. Apology, Art. 7. "We also believe, teach, and confess, that no Church should condemn another because one observes more or less of those outward ceremonies which God has not commanded, than the other, if they agree in other respects, that is, in the doctrine and in all its articles, as also in the right use of the holy Sacraments." Form of Conc. Epit. Art. 10.

In our first thesis we showed with sufficient clearness that private confession does not rest upon an explicit divine command, and cannot, therefore, be made binding upon the conscience of men, but that it is simply a human provision which Christians are privileged to enjoy. Therefore, those Churches where private confession has no place,

should not be condemned as heretical, and those individuals who cannot see the wisdom of this provision, should not be deprived of the holy Sacrament of the altar. Luther was an earnest and valiant defender of private confession, yet, in one of his sermons, directed against the fanatical Carlstadt, he writes: "I will not be deprived of private confession. Yet, will I not compel any one to accept it, or have any one forced to it; but each one should be free in this respect."

Though private confession has always been highly esteemed in the Lutheran Church, yet, it has never been the practice of the Church to condemn as un-Lutheran those congregations where this custom was not in vogue.

The theological faculty in Wittenberg, in the year 1619, wrote: "We do not deny that private confession is not used in all orthodox churches, where there is, notwithstanding, the forgiveness of sins, and the right use of the holy Sacraments, therefore the confessional stool is not provided for either of these purposes."

Further, the Wittenberg theologian, F. Balduin, writes: "If in those Churches where the private confession is in use, it can be omitted by certain persons, under certain circumstances, much rather can it be omitted in those places where it is not in use, and where the Lord's Supper is held in its purity, as is the case in certain places in Upper Germany, and still the holy Sacrament is used salutarily. The essence of the Sacraments cannot depend upon the use of those things which belong to the Adiaphora."

Thus writes also the Leipsic theologian, Hieronomus Kromayer: "Although private confession has no divine command, and by many orthodox Churches, e. g. the Strasburg and Swedish Churches, is regarded as belonging to the Adiaphora, still it has the support of examples in the Holy Scriptures, and is not to be despised. That, in our Church, no one is received to the Holy Supper except he has confessed his sins, is an institution of the Church. On this account they do not condemn those Churches which do not have private confession."

III. Private confession is of great advantage, and a special comfort to the believer, and should, therefore, be encouraged in our Churches.

Private absolution is of great advantage to the believer. It enables the penitent to unburden his heart more fully than he finds opportunity for doing in the general, or common confession. In the latter he simply answers affirmatively the words of the confession which his confessor reads for him. In the former, he confesses in his own words, in those words in which his disturbed conscience and burdened heart find fullest expression and greatest relief. In the general confession there is only an acknowledgment of sins in general, while particular sins, which especially burden the heart and conscience, and which especially increase the doubts and fears which invariably find place in the penitent heart, do not receive that special attention which is necessary for the comfort and safety of the penitent. It was an advantage to David to say to Nathan, directly and personally, "I have sinned against the Lord," 2 Sam. 12, 13; and to the prodigal son to say, "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son." Luke 15, 21.

Not only is private confession an advantage to the penitent sinner because it gives him an opportunity of expressing the fullness of his heart in his own words, and of specifying particular sins which especially trouble him, but also because it gives the necessary opportunity for the confessor to administer such reproof, rebuke, instruction, and comfort as the circumstances and sins of the individual demand. In some general respects the experience of all Christians is alike, and therefore a general confession and absolution meet the requirements in a general way. But the experiences of no two individuals are alike in every respect. Each has its own special and particular features, and therefore general, or public reproof, rebuke and instruction, and the general, or public, absolution will not meet the necessities of the individual. Each individual needs instruction suited to the special features of his experience, and inasmuch as private confession affords the most excellent opportunity, and perhaps the only opportunity for such

particular instruction, it is evidently a great advantage to the penitent sinner.

Private absolution is also a special comfort to the penitent.

It will indeed bring comfort to the heart of the penitent sinner to hear the words, "I declare unto all who do truly repent and heartily believe in Jesus Christ, and are sincerely resolved to amend your sinful lives, the forgiveness of all your sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." But this comfort is the conclusion from a process of reasoning, as follows: The forgiveness of sins is to all "who do truly repent." I do truly repent and believe, therefore the declaration of forgiveness is to me also. But many are not able properly to reason in this way, and fail to arrive at this conclusion at all, and in every case the comfort is not so fully realized as it is when the same persons can possess it without this process of reasoning.

Over and against this general declaration of forgiveness, the direct and personal declaration of absolution to the individual, is a special comfort. In comparison with the general declaration, the direct and personal absolution which Nathan pronounced to David, "The Lord also hath put away *thy* sin," (2 Sam. 12. 13) is supremely comforting. The same is true also of the personal absolution pronounced to the one sick with the palsy, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." Matt. 9, 2. And also the direct absolution pronounced to the sinful woman, "Thy sins be forgiven thee." Luke 7, 48. A general proclamation of amnesty to a rebel army is, undoubtedly, comforting to every individual in it, but a properly written, signed, and sealed pardon directed to each individual soldier personally would prove especially comforting, and if there were certain soldiers in that army who had been guilty of particular misdemeanors against the King, such a particular, individual pardon would prove of especial comfort to them.

Luther fully knew and appreciated private confession and absolution, for he wrote: "I will permit no one to take from me private confession, and would not give it for all the treasure of the world. No one knows the possibil-

ities of private confession, except those who must frequently battle with Satan. I would long since have been conquered and destroyed by the devil, if this private confession had not sustained me. There are many doubtful and erroneous affairs in which man cannot well direct himself, and which he cannot well comprehend. When one is in such a doubtful situation, and does not know his way out, he takes his brother aside, and places his troubles before him, acknowledges his weakness, his unbelief, and his sins, and begs of him comfort and advice.

"What does it matter if he humbles himself a little before his neighbor, and puts himself to a little shame? If thou dost experience comfort from thy brother, then accept it, and believe it, as if God Himself had said it unto thee, as Christ does indeed say, (Matt. 18, 19. 20): "Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

"We must also have many absolutions that we may, thereby, strengthen and comfort our troubled conscience, and despairing hearts, against the devil, and before God: therefore no one shall forbid private confession, nor withhold it from any. He who is tormented with his sins, and desires to be free from them, and wishes to hear a certain comfort and declaration, by which his heart is pacified: he goes and laments his sins, in private, with his brother, begs him for absolution, and a word of comfort. If he grants the absolution, and says to thee, thy sins are forgiven thee, thou hast a gracious God and a merciful Father, which will not impute thy sins unto thee. Then believe, fully and joyfully, this declaration and absolution, and be assured that God Himself makes this declaration unto thee through thy brother's mouth."—Spirit of Luther's Writings, p. 254.

Private confession being both a great advantage and a special comfort to believers, it is evident to all that it should be encouraged in our Churches. This does not mean that private confession *must* have place in our Churches. In many Churches it is not found at all, and in many others it is not highly regarded. In such cases it should not be forced upon a congregation as a matter essential to the

existence of a true Church, but we should labor, *in the spirit of Christ*, which is the spirit of love and patience, to introduce it where it is not practiced, to maintain it where it is already found, but endangered by ignorance, or prejudice, and to create a due respect for it, where it is now disregarded.

USAGES OF THE LITURGY.

BY REV. M. R. WALTER, LOUDONVILLE, OHIO.

Several different publications have recently brought the intelligence that the liturgy is now being introduced into many Churches which formerly disregarded it entirely. Some of these Churches are almost in danger of becoming ritualistic. Devotional books are being introduced by pastors of those denominations which formerly maintained that no good could result from such kind of worship. Christmas, Easter, Missionary and other like liturgies are being spread broadcast in Churches of all Protestant denominations and show the trend of the times. These are certainly good omens. They are indicative of more churchliness in the worship.

The arguments for the use of the liturgy have always been clearly stated by the Lutheran Church. She has from the time of the Reformation given the true prominence to the Church service and worship, but she has also at all times steered clear from all Romanistic and Anglican ritualism. In consequence of this, she has not laid down any law binding congregations to observe certain liturgical forms and rites, as though they were required as confessional. Frequently we hear some good brother bemoaning the fact that there is not a uniformity in Church government and liturgical services in the Lutheran Church, like it is found in the Anglican Church. It is true that the Book of Common Prayer in the Episcopal Church has proven a bond of external union, but it has not produced a unity of faith.

But this spirit of freedom in the usage of the forms of government and worship in the Lutheran Church has dem-

onstrated her strength. In these non-essentials she is flexible, and is adaptable to circumstances and environments. This is readily seen in the various usages of the liturgy and Church government in the different sections in Europe and America. But in questions of faith she stands firm. The Word of God and her clear Confessions exhibiting the doctrines of that Word, are her strength and bulwark and her only bond of union. Nevertheless, the Lutheran Church always has given careful attention to her liturgies, that they should be correct in statement, churchly in character, and adapted to the service throughout. Her liturgies are of the very highest rank. From the rich stores of her liturgies and Agenda, the liturgies of all the other Protestant denominations have been drawn. The Lutheran is not a Church of sentimentality. Her rites and ceremonies are not for entertainment, but for edification of the worshiper and the glorifying of God; her liturgical services are not for sensationalism, nor for mere euphonious effects, but for the reason that they are salutary.

The use of certain Church forms is not the test of Lutheran standard nor the test for Lutheran unity; the test is the purity of doctrine, in confession and practice. Unprincipled proselytizers often resort to trickery, so as to deceive the guileless Lutheran emigrants by saying, "We are the genuine Church you are looking for. We have the robe, the forms and the books." But they have neither the faith nor the spirit of the Lutheran Church.

At the time of the Reformation a great portion of the Reformed Church was iconoclastic, prohibiting art in the structure of churches and curtailing the liturgical services very much. The influence of these Churches was exerted over many Lutheran parishes in the South German States in respect to the liturgical services. Yet in all Lutheran parishes the liturgy has been used to a certain extent, but the particular forms were left to the choice of the congregations. But Lutheran influence in liturgics has preponderated over the Reformed ideas. The Anglican Church has virtually adopted the Lutheran forms of worship. The French Churches have nearly all improved their Argenda, introducing much from the Lutheran service. Holland, too, has a better service than at the beginning, and even the Scottish Churches are beginning to fall in ranks, but

not so rapidly as in some other quarters. The reason why the liturgical services are being more generally used is that the subject is being studied better and prejudices are being overcome. One object of the liturgical service is to simplify the worship, so that the congregation may have a clearer conception of the service and be enabled better to follow its intent; or, in the responsive service to take part with heart and voice in an orderly and churchly manner, without confusion of mind, as is brought about where different extemporaneous services are rendered at each service. By the use of well established Church services, the hearer is better prepared for the reception of the sermon and benediction.

Vinet, a French theologian, in speaking of the meagerness of the French Reformed liturgy, says: "Our liturgy would be improved if it had certain characteristics which belong to the worship of other Churches. The litany, for example, may seem riduculous; but, in truth, there is something in it which represents the normal state of a soul which recollects itself in the divine presence. The Christian should be a child, and consequently should speak the language of a child. The simpler, the more child-like the means, the better are they. The litany is something childlike: This is its excellence, its truth." Again he says: "There should remain in worship something fixed and immutable. The people, to a certain extent, should be *churchly*,* that is to say, attached to the forms of their worship. There seems to be no necessity that this should lead to formalism."

In performing churchly acts and ceremonies, such as Baptism, Marriages, Confirmations and the like, the pastor should use the forms given in the liturgy. To change the form of service for the sake of novelty, or to suit the whims and notions of individuals, is not to be commended. It is by no means an evidence of acumen or intellect to thus arbitrarily make innovations upon the established forms, but, rather, a sign of egotism. In these churchly functions Bengel recommends "great exactness," because hearers readily notice changes and are apt to judge that there are

* The Author uses in both the French and English editions of his work the German Word *Kirchlich* to fully express his meaning.

also changes in doctrine. A uniformity of liturgical services in the Lutheran Church in America is much to be desired. But such uniformity of Church usages must be brought about by the voluntary choice and action of the congregations and not by constraint; for should the Lutheran Church ever make the use of certain liturgical forms binding upon the pastors and the congregations, she would then cease to be the Church of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession. We want no unification of the Church upon such a basis. Let her remain true to the faith once delivered to the saints, which faith has always been hers. Upon that faith, so explicitly presented in her Confessions, let her unity depend, and the questions of the usages of liturgies, uniformity in forms, will adjust themselves.

EDUCATION IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

ADDRESS AT SOLDIERS' HOME, AUGUST 6, 1896, BY REV. PROF. CARL ACKERMANN, LIMA, OHIO.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century was in large measure an outburst of thought, a cutting loose from the bondage of ignorance, error and superstition. Hence from her very birth the Lutheran Church is known to the world as an educating Church. And her whole history from that day to this, has been an uninterrupted story of education for her ministry, her laity, and her children. The centuries preceding the Reformation have been called the dark ages—dark because of the error and superstition with which the masses were held; dark because of the ignorance and blindness of their hearts.

When Luther was commissioned to do the work of reform, he realized he must do it by spreading the light of knowledge. And he set to work with all the burning zeal of which his intense nature was capable to establish schools and systems of education. He looked upon these as the most effective instruments to usher in the reign of truth. What he accomplished in this direction the world knows and a grateful posterity points back with pride to him and

his co-workers as the teachers of Germany and through Germany of the world, points back to him as the originator of the whole modern system of education.

While the great reformer was not enabled to realize fully the consummation of his beneficent plans, he kindled a fire which has burned in the breasts of his followers from the period of the Reformation until now wherever they have entered into the spirit of his work.

Perhaps before going over to the consideration of what the Church has done in the work of education, the consideration of a principle or two which are fundamental to Protestantism and in the largest measure to Lutheranism, will show us that of a necessity these principles fostered the cause of education. The two great truths upon which the Reformation was fought are these:

1. Man is justified by faith alone,

2. The Bible is the only rule of faith and life. According to the idea of Luther all become by faith in Jesus Christ kings and priests unto God, without the intervention of priest or Church. His system made Christ the center of all Christianity. And with the Scriptures as his guide through his whole career, the Christian is elevated "to the freedom and dignity of ordering his own religious life. The feeling of individual responsibility is awakened and thus the spirit of inquiry fostered. Intelligence becomes a necessity. The Bible must be studied; teachers must be provided; schools must be established;" and Lutheranism becomes the mother of popular education and the friend of universal learning.

Even many Catholic writers have come to a realization of this fact. An able French scholar has said: "In rendering man responsible for his faith and in placing the source of that faith in holy Scripture, the Reformation contracted the obligation of placing everyone in a condition to save himself by reading and studying the Bible. Instruction became thus the first of the duties of charity; and all who had charge of souls, from the father of a family to the magistrates of cities and to the sovereign of the State, were called upon, in the name of their own salvation, and each according to the measure of his responsibility, to favor popular education."

With such an effective stimulus for the work of educa-

tion, is it any wonder that we are able to point with pride to the achievements of our Church in the field of learning?

In his own day Luther addressed an appeal to the magistrates and legislators of Germany for the cause of universal education and well says: "The safety and strength of a city reside above all in a good education, which furnishes it with instructed, reasonable, honorable, and well-trained citizens." As already said he himself set to work at establishing schools and by his efforts aroused all Protestant Germany. His schools were especially of the elementary and secondary character, and in their courses of study and methods of instruction became models after which many others were fashioned. In a few years it is said the whole of Protestant Germany was supplied with schools. Defective as they were, especially because of the want of suitable teachers, they were so much in advance of what had existed before that their introduction marks an epoch in the cause of education especially of the common people. At the same time his efforts in the improvement of the work of the University has made him the leading educational Reformer of the sixteenth century also in this field.

Has the Lutheran Church been true to the trust which has been handed down to her by the Lord through the great Reformer? Go with me if you will to the lands in which Lutheranism is the ruling spirit and ascertain the results in the fields of education. Go where we will and she has cradled the child in the lap of learning, has poured out to the youth of the fountains of wisdom, and led her men to the depths of understanding and knowledge as no other people have. No other land has furnished "such thorough, generous and universal systems of instruction as those in which the Lutheran creed has been predominant."

Germany, the birthplace of the Church, and still the home of a large number of her children, is known to the world as the land of scholars. Joseph Cook calls it "the most learned land on the globe." And statistics prove that of German States, the most Lutheran are the most learned. The report of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1880 gave the ratio of illiterates to population in the German empire at 237 to 10,000; but in Würtemberg, one of the most Lutheran of all the States, it is only 2 to 10,000.

Comparing these statistics with those of some of the oldest and most advanced States in our own land, we find that Massachusetts had 640 out of every 10,000 who could not read and write; New York 530, Pennsylvania 670, Ohio 490. In other words Massachusetts had 320 times as many illiterates as Würtemberg, New York 265 times as many, Pennsylvania 335 times as many, and Ohio 245 times as many. Turning to the lands of the Danish and Scandinavian peninsulas, we find the results even more astounding. "Education has been compulsory for over 40 years; the school term averages 8 months and over 97 per cent of all the population of school age are in attendance at schools of some kind—'a percentage,'" as the U. S. Bureau of Education says, "'which is probably not exceeded by any other nation.' President Cattell reports to the Educational Bureau of our Government that such a thing as a man signing X (his mark) because he never had learned to write can scarcely occur there."

The same educational conditions exist in regard to the collegiate and university work in these Lutheran lands. In Scandinavia alone with a population less than double that of Ohio, there are 120 colleges and universities with an average attendance in each of nearly 200. In Germany we have almost innumerable higher schools, gymnasiums, progymnasiums, realgymnasien, real-progymnasien, realschulen, oberrealschulen, and höhere bürgerschulen. Besides these Germany has 21 universities. These are her pride and glory. "They exert more influence than any similar institution in any other country. They reflect a picture of the whole world of nature and of mind under its ideal form. They exert a powerful influence upon other countries. Situated in the heart of Europe, and visited by strangers from all quarters of the globe, they are the firmest anchors of general learning and literature." Without pursuing this side of the question any further, let it be said that other Lutheran lands furnish parallel examples.

The special object and aim of the work of education in which the Reformer and his followers engaged, is characteristic of the spirit of Lutheranism. The Reformer placed the subject of Christianity and religion first in his curriculum of studies, then the classics, mathematics, his-

tory and nature study. In this manner only did he believe man could be truly educated. And the same conception of education has guided the work of the Church to an important degree in all ages. She has always held that all the powers of man should be developed, that the child should be educated and trained in morals and religion and that to miss this is to miss the chief end for which schools have been established. In all largely Lutheran lands she therefore has her parish school as the Christian nursery for her children. By the side of every Church she has her Christian school-house presided over by consecrated men and women. She has held that the young should be trained inside the Church and not outside of it, and the Bible, Catechism, hymn and prayerbook have held their place by the side of the branches of secular education. In this manner did she lay the foundation of those solid virtues for which Lutherans have always been distinguished.

In the education of her young men and women, her teachers and her ministry the same spirit has directed her.

Is it any wonder then that her work of education has been such a powerful factor in the education and affairs of men in general? Is it any wonder that her universities have guided the realm of thought these three hundred years? Well says Dr. Seiss: "Her universities have been the pride of Germany for the last three hundred years, her critics and religious teachers have been the leading instructors of Christendom from the days of Luther until now. Take from the religious literature of the nations all that has been, directly or indirectly, derived from Lutheran divines and the ecclesiastical heavens would be bereft of most of its stars. Strike out the long list of Lutheran names and writings, in whatever department, which each of these past three centuries has furnished, and a void would be made for which all the ages could produce no adequate compensation."

Transplanted to these Western shores, has the Lutheran Church lost the spirit of her fathers? Has she ceased bearing the light of learning among the children of men? Have her labors in the field of education been commensurate with the opportunities which have been hers in this Western world? The precious treasure which had been

given her has happily not been lost; the light of learning has not been extinguished in this new fatherland.

With our forefathers came the spirit of learning. They had enjoyed the blessing of the school and university of Germany and Scandinavia, and from the beginning made efforts to establish colleges and schools. While numerous difficulties for a time prevented the carrying out of the former, the elementary schools were not wanting; and the early history of our country furnishes noble examples of self-sacrificing zeal for the Christian education of the children. Even before their Churches were founded our fathers must have the little log school-house. While the German and Scandinavian population in a large measure still retain the parochial school, the English-speaking portion has almost universally discarded it. The peculiar circumstances which surround us in this new home, have no doubt contributed largely to such a result; but the influence of surroundings and the spirit of the times have gone a great way toward bringing it about. It is not my purpose to discuss this subject at any length,—time will not permit—but I will say the loss which we have sustained in the spirituality and faith of our children has by no means been compensated for by the possible gain, as is claimed, through the introduction of the public school. This much is certainly true that the present state of elementary education calls for extraordinary efforts for the religious instruction of our children in the Sunday school, Church and home.

Though the Lutheran college was somewhat slow in developing because of unavoidable difficulties, the work which has been done in our own land, especially during the present century, has been of such a character that we have no need to be ashamed. The Lutheran Church has established manifold colleges, high schools and theological seminaries. I believe I am correct if I say her people have as a rule not been among the wealthier class and hence the establishment of these schools has entailed a great deal of courage, struggle and self-sacrifice upon her people and especially upon those who have been actively engaged in their founding. By means of these schools she has maintained in some measure the high ideal of scholarship for which she is famed. Her sons have occupied influential

positions in many of the States. Her scholars have been among the leading educators of the land. While it is proverbial that she has the best educated ministry in the land. Coming to our own State, for I believe I have a duty to perform on this occasion towards our existing institutions, the question naturally looms up, Has the Lutheran Church done for the work of education in Ohio what would be commensurate with her growth in numbers and in wealth? Four institutions of the State bear the Lutheran name, Wittenberg, Capital University, Woodville and Lima College. Of these the first two have been in existence for half a century, Woodville has existed for some 15 years, and Lima for three years. Of these Wittenberg is connected with the General Synod, Capital University and Woodville are the institutions of the Joint Synod, while Lima though owned and controlled by members of the Joint Synod is in reality a private enterprise. Wittenberg and Capital University are colleges and theological seminaries, Woodville has for its object the education of parochial school teachers, while Lima College has for its chief object the establishment of a conservatory of music, a business college and a normal school. These institutions certainly cover a wide range of subjects in the educational field and in a large measure supplement each other. The fruits of scholarship of the older institutions are already known and I hope the work which the junior institution has been doing during the past three years has not been unworthy of the Lutheran name.

With what support has this work met? Has the support which has been given been commensurate with the growth in number of membership and in wealth? My friends, these are important questions. Grateful as I am to all for the support which has been given, yet when I look over the fertile farms, the beautiful homes and the evidences of prosperity and wealth on all sides, I feel we have not done our duty by them, and the ideal prosperity and usefulness has not been reached. Their work has been hindered very much by the lack of sufficient funds and by the fact that many of our Lutheran boys and girls are visiting other institutions. Let me simply call attention to one department of our educational work. I am told by those who are in a position to know that in two of

our popular Ohio normal schools there are generally 75 or more Lutheran students. Why are these not in their own schools? Young men and women of other Churches are coming to our schools because of the high grade of scholarship which is offered. Why should our own children go elsewhere? Certainly this is a condition of affairs which ought to be remedied by us. The wealthier classes of other communions are endowing their institutions and by so doing enable them to widen their sphere of usefulness. My friends, why can not our schools be so endowed?

These, it seems to me, are questions which we ought to discuss and agitate in such gatherings as this and in our own homes until we fully awake to a realization of the heritage that has been left us and the duties that devolve upon us, and the glorious prospects which lie before us if we fulfill that duty.

From the heights to which our fathers raised in this work during the past three centuries they are looking down upon us. They are beckoning to us to move up higher. Shall their labors spur us on to greater things?

In the faithful application of the principles of the Lutheran Reformation lies the hope of our country. Let us move forward until an ungrateful world shall come to a realization of what it owes to the great Lutheran communion, and the nations shall gather for refreshment at the overflowing wells of spiritual life and truth as proclaimed and taught by the divines and teachers of our beloved Lutheran Zion.

THE CHURCH YEAR.

BY REV. PROF. L. H. SCHUH, Ph. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

The Lutheran Church seeks to understand the present in the light of the past. In her conservatism she has essayed to keep up the continuity of the Church. Unlike the sects, she has not attempted violently to break the thread of history and then to discard the rich legacy of former centuries. She vividly realizes that the present is the product of that which has gone before, as well as

the germ of that which is to come. Hence her regard for those customs which were born of the spiritual life of the Church and hallowed by centuries of use. The liturgical service, the use of the pericope system and the observance of the Church Year, together with other products of spiritual life, have all so endeared themselves to her that nothing is further from her spirit than to ignore them.

She observes the Church Year. The Church Year is the presentation to the Christian congregation within the space of a year of the great facts in the life of Christ in the order of their succession and their application to the congregation for the conception, development and perfecting of spiritual life. The underlying idea of the Church Year is, that within that natural cycle of time called a year, there shall be exhibited to the Church a complete life of Christ and an application made of it to the people for the complete course of spiritual life. The cardinal facts in the life of Christ are set forth, not in a disconnected way, but in the order of succession; and their application is made to every phase of soul life. There is then a complete presentation of the plan of salvation in its objective development, and in its subjective application. The Church year thus affords the widest, deepest and most systematic study of the life of Christ. No essential feature is slighted or overlooked. The full advantage of this scheme is apparent to him only who has studied its development and noticed that it is an outgrowth of the very life of the Church.

The Church Year is a human arrangement, as its observance is nowhere commanded of God. Yet it is not a human invention. It is a natural product; the outgrowth of the spiritual wants of believers. It, therefore, has a development and consequently a history. It was centuries in unfolding to its present perfect state.

The early Christians immediately following Jesus, observed no especial days; not even Sunday. To them all days were alike. Daily they met for public worship and the celebration of the Eucharist. This being over, they dispersed to follow their earthly calling. A feeling soon manifested itself to have special days of worship and rest. As the Apostolic Church had a large Hebrew contingent, the analogy of the Old Testament could not fail to be without influence. Soon one day in seven gains the supremacy as

a day of worship. The first of the week was chosen as God had honored that above others, by the resurrection of Christ. As this day met a universal want, its observance soon became universal. Sunday thus became the starting point; from it the Church Year was evolved.

Early Christians were soon not content to observe Sunday, but a desire became apparent to celebrate the cardinal facts in the life of Jesus, by special days and festivities. The central doctrine of apostolic and early Christian preaching as well as the foundation and finial of the Christian system of dogmas, is the resurrection of our Lord. As this fact began to stand out in bold relief in the consciousness of the Church, there was born an irresistible impulse to emphasize it by special services. Easter was born, not made. It is the oldest and chief of the high festivals. Traces of its observance may be found in the first century, and in the second its celebration began to be common.

After Easter, Pentecost came into existence, following the same law of development. The outpouring of the Holy Ghost was of such importance to the Church that this its natal day called forth in the hearts of believers a spontaneous celebration. This festival found its analogy in the Old Testament Pentecost, this being one of the three high annual festivals commanded by Jehovah. True, Pentecost was observed in memory of a different circumstance and not from a legal but a voluntary motive. Its first traces are to be found in the second century, and soon thereafter it became common. Easter naturally suggested good Friday and demanded it. Pentecost demanded Ascension; and when these four high festivals were observed, the complete cycle of the life of Jesus as well as the wants of the Church called for the youngest of the festivals, Christmas. So by a gradual evolution extending through four and a half centuries, the observance of sacred seasons reached its completion in the five high festivals commemorative of the five cardinal facts in the life of our Lord.

The Church Year is divided into two almost equal parts. They are called "The Half Year of Our Lord," and "The Half Year of the Church." In the first half year the life of Christ is systematically and chronologically presented to the congregation; and in the second half there is an ap-

plication made to the life of the believer in the logical order of its development.

The Sundays of "The Half Year of Our Lord" cluster around the three chief festivals, Christmas, Easter and Good Friday. Until the fifth century, Easter was the beginning of the Church Year, as it commemorated the pinnacle in Christ's life. But a growing demand for a more chronological arrangement made the start with Christmas.

Each festive cycle is complete in itself. It has its ante-celebration, or a Sunday or Sundays which lead up by gradual ascent to the chief celebration. And then a post celebration which leads down from the Tabor heights.

It must be noticed here that together with the evolution of the Church Year, there followed as a necessary complement a selection of texts, called the Pericope System. While it is not within the scope of this paper properly to discuss these, their thorough study is necessary for the correct understanding of the Church Year.

The Christmas cycle is introduced by the four Advent Sundays. In this ante-celebration the chief idea is as the name of the season, Advent, suggests, The coming. The Church treats texts which will prepare the congregation for the coming of Christ into the flesh. The congregation is prepared for the chief festival, which is formed by Christmas itself, the day after Christmas, the Sunday after Christmas, if such occurs, New Year, the octave of Christmas, the Sunday after New Year, when it occurs, and Epiphany. The post-celebration is formed by the Epiphany Sundays, never more than six in number. It will interest students of liturgics to note how forcibly the prescribed texts in this and other festive seasons, bring out step by step the idea of the season, and how they form a complete scheme for the study of Christ's life.

The Sundays in Lent form the ante-celebration for the Easter cycle. There are eight Sundays comprised in this section. What a blessed season this time is and how it leads the congregation up to that greatest of all Church festivals, Easter! The chief festival is formed by Palm Sunday, Monday, Thursday, Good Friday, Easter, the day after Easter, and the octave of the festival, Quasimodogeniti. What richness of homiletical material the Great Week affords the preacher, what a wealth of devotion the worshiping as

gregation! The post-celebration is formed by two Sundays: Misericordias Domini and Jubilate, which lead down from the chief celebration.

The Pentecost cycle is introduced by the Sundays Cantate and Rogate as ante-celebration. The chief festival is formed by Ascension Day, the Sunday Exaudi, Pentecost and the day after Pentecost. The post-celebration is the octave of Pentecost, Trinity.

"The Half Year of the Church" is formed by the Sundays after Trinity. It is divided into three cycles, the object of which is to set forth in order, the beginning, the continuation and the end of spiritual life. The first Gospel is the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus concerning the New Birth; the last lessons prescribed are concerning death, judgment and the consummation. So the complete course of faith is exhibited to the congregation.

There are obvious advantages to both congregation and pastor in the observance of the Church Year. The high festivals forcibly call to mind the whole life of Jesus. Their observance assures a complete study of the same and its presentation in all its fullness from the pulpit. The congregation is protected against the hobbies and pet notions of the preacher. Without such an extended plan to present the whole counsel of God for salvation, how many a pastor would sink into a rut and continually present the same truths to the neglect of others. With the strong tendency in the practical ministry to neglect study, this advantage dare not be underrated.

The selection of texts which the Church Year has developed crowds many a pastor into the length and breadth and depth of the Word, much to his own advantage and that of the people. It widens the pastor's horizon to ponder passages of Scripture not of his own choosing. It saves much time for study otherwise consumed by the choosing of texts. Every pastor knows how much time it takes to make suitable selections and how often after a half day's search the text is discarded, and the work begun over. The preacher is protected from much unjust criticism when he administers public reproof from the prescribed text. If the erring brother has the feeling that the text was chosen to give him a public reproof, it fails to accomplish its purpose. To administer reproof from the prescribed text ex-

onerates the pastor of seeking an occasion of venting spite.

The Church Year has come to stay. Even the sectarian Churches are being permeated by it. They cannot afford to ignore the high festivals any longer as they did a quarter or half century ago, and the time is not far distant when they will be much influenced by it.

Our pastors and congregations would be much profited by a deeper study of the subject, as this would lead to an intelligent and profitable observance of this beautiful custom hallowed by centuries of use.

OUR SAVIOR'S MOTHER TONGUE.

BY REV. J. HUMBERGER, A. M., COVINGTON, O.

What Christian is not interested to know all he can about Jesus, and like Mary humbly sit at His feet and hear Him converse in His own vernacular? Who would not be curious to know exactly what language He spoke in His childhood? What was the language of Joseph and Mary, spoken in Nazareth and throughout the villages of Galilee, when Christ spent His life among them?

This was the language in which Christ grew up to manhood, and in which he spoke those wonderful parables, and proclaimed the greatest oration that ever fell from human lips, — the Sermon on the Mount. It was the language of the home life of Jesus, the mother tongue of His people, in which His great heart first learned to pulsate their joys and woes, and feel for all the concerns of human life.

The prevailing view among the earliest church fathers was that the mother tongue of Christ was the Syriac, which they frequently regarded as Hebrew or Chaldean. To this view the church held through all the centuries before the Reformation and long afterwards. And when Widmanstadt in 1555 published the first edition of the Syriac New Testament, it was received with great favor by Christians everywhere, because the linguists of the Church now thought they had the words of our Lord in the very form He spoke them. There were only a few who doubted this.

Among these doubters were Scaliger and Grotius. They claimed that Christ spoke a mixed dialect, current at that time in Palestine.

The Roman Catholics about a hundred years later claimed that Christ's mother tongue was Latin. One Father Inchofer in 1648 advanced this view. Another hundred years later a learned Jesuit, Hardouin, brought forth as a new argument for this view the fact that the Bible officially recognized by the Roman Catholic Church was written in the Latin language.

From this time forth educated Protestants began to advocate the view that Christ spoke Greek, the language of the New Testament. Professor Delitzsch, one of the greatest linguists of modern times, who recently died in Germany, believed that Christ spoke a comparatively pure Hebrew, the study of which was at that time earnestly enforced in all the schools of Palestine.

But many words that are not Greek, and yet are found in the Greek New Testament, prove decidedly that our Savior spoke an Aramaic language, in the form of the dialect of Galilee. The Standard Dictionary defines the Aramaic as follows: 1. "The northern class of the Semitic family of languages, embracing the living Neo-Syriac, recently revived by missionaries, and the dead tongues Chaldee, Syriac, and the languages of the cuneiform inscriptions. 2. The language of Palestine after the captivity; Chaldee as spoken by the Jews, the tongue spoken by Christ and His disciples, and used in the Targums and in a few passages of the Old Testament. Called also *Syro-Chaldaic,* from the fact that it became somewhat mixed with the Syriac branch."

The Aramaic is a branch of the north Semitic language, and hence a sister to the Hebrew. Long before the Old Testament canon was closed, the Aramaic took the place of the Hebrew as the spoken language of the people, and was generally spoken as the commercial language among the nations of Syria, and was thus extended to the far countries of the East. The prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel bear evidence of the influence of this language, so too the later Psalms, Ecclesiastes, and especially Ezra and Daniel, who both partly composed their books in this dialect. During

the time of the Maccabees it actually took the place of the Hebrew as the language of Palestine. It is made use of in the Talmud, and Philo, a contemporary of St. Paul, as well as the historian Josephus, who calls it the "language of the fatherland," bear testimony that it was the universally prevailing language spoken among the common people of all the country of Palestine.

Of course the Hebrew continued to be the language of the holy books. The Hebrew was the official language in which the Holy Scriptures were read in the schools. But they had to be explained to the people in the Aramaic language. The Aramaic commentaries, called "Targums," continue to bear undoubted testimony of this fact. This was done from the simple fact that the common people no longer fully understood the sacred language of their fathers. The current language of the time customary among all the people was Aramaic, which our Savior made use of in His conversation with His disciples and in speaking to the people. The real Hebrew was only known to the learned, and was not fully understood by the people. This can be proven by personal names in our Greek New Testament, which do not come from the Greek, whose form and sound are Aramaic. For instance: "Boanerges." Mark 3, 17. "Talitha cumi," two Syriac words signifying "Damsel arise." (Mark 5, 41). "Ephphatha," Aramaic, be thou opened (Mark 7, 34). "Maran atha," the Lord cometh, 1 Cor. 16, 22. The expression of Christ on the cross: "Eloi, eloi lama sabachthani," Mark 15, 34. These Aramaic expressions the writers of the Greek New Testament quote in such a way as to imply that that was the language Christ constantly employed in speeaking to His followers.

Christ spoke the language of His people, and that language was the Galilean dialect of the Aramaic. At this time there were current in Palestine three dialects of the Aramaic: the Jerusalem, the Samaritan and the Galilean. In the night when Christ was brought before Pilate, Peter was discovered and known from the fact that he spoke the Galilean dialect. It was in this language that Christ first learned the words of His mother, conversed with the playmates of His childhood, called His disciples, spoke to the multitudes of people who listened with pathos to the words

of His parables, and were enraptured by the sermon on the mount.

The particular form of this Galilean dialect of the Aramaic is found in the socalled "Jerusalem Talmud," which was written in the third and fourth centuries after Christ, in the city of Tiberias on the sea of Galilee. This work was composed in the language of the common people of Galilee, and is the only extant work, either of a religious or secular nature, written in the very same dialect which Christ made use of in the days of His earthly pilgrimage.

THE LITERARY ORIGIN OF THE ACTS.

BY PROF. G. H. SCHODDE, Ph. D., COLUMBUS, O.

One of the most marked problems of biblical literature deals with the origin, composition, and historical reliability of the Acts of the Apostles. With the possible exception of Revelation, this is the only New Testament book which has been subjected to an analysis such as has been so vigorously and rigorously applied to the sacred writings of the Old Covenant. Something like the documentary theory that lies at the bottom of the entire Pentateuchal scheme current in our times has been applied to the Acts also, notably to the so-called "We sections," in which the author speaks of himself as a participant in the events recorded, and which portions are thought at one time to have existed as a separate historical document. As is the case in the Old Testament criticism, this composition theory is made the basis of charges against the historical correctness of the contents of Acts.

In the discussions of the pros and cons of this question, the most noteworthy contribution for many years is an entirely new departure in vindication of the historical correctness of the Acts, made, not by a theologian, but by a philologian, namely, Professor Dr. Fr. Blass, of the University of Halle, a recognized authority in the department of classical literature. It consists of a sharp attack upon the whole theory of literary dissection, as far as applied

to this book at least, and finds the solution of the literary peculiarities of Acts in the theory that the author himself—Luke, the companion of the Apostle Paul—issued at different times two distinct editions of his own work. The researches of Blass, which have attracted the widest attention, and have found also a warm endorsement on the part of leading New Testament specialists, are embodied in a Latin volume entitled "Acta Apostolorum sine Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter. Editio philologica, apparatu critico illustrata." (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1895, Price, about $3.) The author's opinion of literary dissection is interesting reading. He says:

"This art the theologians have learned from the philologians. What the philologians did in the case of Homer, the theologians are doing with Acts. But since philology has developed more fully, we make but little use of this art. Through the researches of Schliemann and Dörpfeld, philologians have learned to believe that the Troy of Homer actually existed, that it was captured by the Greeks commanded by King Agamemnon, that Helen was the cause of this war. The theologians, however, continue to declare the reports of the Gospels and the Acts to be incorrect and of cloudy origin. For what can arise out of mist and smoke except mist and smoke?"

The theory of Blass is based upon the fact that of Acts as well as of the third Gospel we have two groups of manuscripts. This phenomenon is not discovered now for the first time, but has never before been utilized as it is being done at present. The one group of manuscripts, called the Eastern, or Oriental, text, is represented by the great uncial codices, the Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and others, and furnishes the text current in our editions of the Bible. A text largely divergent from this is found in the famous and unique Greek-Latin Codex Bezae, or D, of the University of Cambridge, in the Syriac version of Philoxenus, in the Latin palimpsest manuscript of Fleury and several Latin church fathers, notably Cyprian and Augustine. The chief source of this Western, or Occidental, text is the Codex D, presented to the University of Cambridge by Theodore Beza, the pupil and collaborator of Calvin, who was so perplexed by its strange readings that he declared the

manuscript to be suitable "rather for preservation than for publication," as the variants, notably to the third Gospel, might offend Christians. And, in fact, no edition of this codex was published until 1793, when the university published it in facsimile, a new edition appearing in 1864.

In comparing the variants of the D text, Blass reaches the conclusion that these readings represent a more crude and unfinished edition of the text, and accordingly an earlier form of the Book of Acts than we have in the Eastern or canonical form. In a number of cases the D text gives details not found in the other group of manuscripts, these editions being of a kind to show that they formed an original part of the text to be omitted by the author in revising the text. Then this D text contains exact statements of time not found in the accepted text, yet of a kind that excludes the possibility of their being later additions. Then, thirdly, in reference to places, actions, and, also the actors, the D group contains data that give it independent worth, and show that these statements could not have been derived from the Eastern text.

Only a few examples of the divergencies of the two texts can be given here. Thus, to chapter 5: 15 Codex D adds the words, "And they were delivered from every sickness which each one had." To the eighteenth verse of the same chapter this addition is made: "And each one went to his house." To the words of Gamaliel (5: 39) the addition is made: "Nor can kings and tyrants therefore refrain from these men." In 6: 1, Codex D adds the words at the close: "By the deacons of the Hebrews." In verse 11 this addition is found: "Since they now could no longer resist the truth." Concerning Simon the sorcerer, this codex reports "that he did not cease to weep continually." In chapter 9: 30, it reports that the brethren had brought Saul to Cesarea "during the night." In some cases this codex betrays the closest knowledge of details, as, for example, in the report of Peter's release from the prison, the current account states that he passed out of the prison and went upon the street; the codex D inserts here the words, "They descended the seven steps." Thus again, in 19: 9, we are informed that this reasoning of Paul in the school of Tyrannus took place "from the fifth to the tenth hour." In chap-

ter 11: 27, 28, the coming of Agabus to Antiochia is reported. In ecclesiastical tradition he is regarded as a native of Antiochia. This explains the reading in the Beza text, which reads, "And there was great joy. And there stood up one of them," etc.

A close comparison of these two groups of readings has convinced Blass that their connection is of such a character that only the theory of a twofold edition of the work by Luke himself can explain their presence and peculiarities; and that the Western or Bezae group represents the older, and, as it were, rougher form of the Acts, the author's revision appearing in the currently accepted Eastern or canonical text.

Blass himself already draws attention to the fact that a double edition of a literary work by the author is a phenomenon met with not infrequently. He draws attention particularly to the Demosthenes Third Oration against Philip, and to Piers the Plowman. Professor Zöckler, in the *Greifswalder Studien* (Gütersloh, 1895, p. 132), mentions a number of other and similar cases. It is well known, for instance, that Tertullian published revised editions of his Christian works. He himself states that he issued his work "Against Marcion" in three different editions. His work "Against the Jews" appeared in two forms. The same is true of the great work of Lactantius on "The Institutions." In both classical literature and the writings of the middle ages parallels can be found in considerable number. Luke's two editions of the Acts is accordingly not a literary phenomenon without parallel.

It is noteworthy, in this connection, that the theory of Blass has found friends, not only among the conservatives, who are naturally quite anxious to utilize it in the interests of the authenticity and historical fidelity of the records of this book, but also that theologians of a radical type cannot see their way clear to a refutation of his view. In so representative a liberal work as Jülicher's *Einleitung* to the New Testament, it is simply stated that the theory is not yet demonstrated. No actual effort has been made to refute this new explanation of the textual idiosyncrasies of Acts.